

DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

"OPEN THY MOUTH FOR THE DUMB, IN THE CAUSE OF ALL SUCH AS ARE APPOINTED TO DESTRUCTION; OPEN THY MOUTH, JUDGE RIGHTEOUSLY, AND PLEAD THE CAUSE OF THE POOR AND NEEDY."—1st Eccl. xxi. 8, 9.

VOLUME III. }
NUMBER III. }

ROCHESTER, NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1860.

PRICE—
ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM.

CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT NUMBER.

A Word of Explanation.....	305
The Church Anti-Slavery Society.....	305
Hon. Gerrit Smith.....	306
The Prospect in the Future.....	306
Rev. George B. Cheever.....	307
The Republican Party.....	308
The Democratic Party.....	308
Gentleman.....	309
The Candidates for President.....	309
Imputation.....	310
Thirty-Two Years in the Sandwich Islands.....	310
The Veto of the Homestead Bill.....	310
A Judge in a Fix.....	311
The Anglo-African.....	311
Progressive Library Association of Chicago.....	311
Hon. Gerrit Smith to Frederick Douglass.....	312
Frederick Douglass at Home.....	314
Wholesale Kidnapping.....	315
The London Press on Mr. Sumner's Speech.....	316
Letter from L. Maria Child.....	317
Owen Lovejoy at Gerrit Smith's.....	317
Massachusetts sustains Senator Sumner.....	317
Monthly Summary.....	318
Miscellaneous News Items.....	319
The Senate during Sumner's great Speech.....	320
Terms, Agents, Advertisement, &c. &c.....	320

DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

A WORD OF EXPLANATION.

DEAR READERS:—We shall, for a time, only greet you monthly. The means of publishing our weekly are, for the present, denied us. From the prompt manner in which a few of our delinquent subscribers 'paid up' five weeks ago, we ventured to promise the continuance of the *weekly*. The example of these honest and thoughtful few, we are sorry to say, has not been followed, as we hoped it would be, by the many who owe for the paper; and we have, therefore, for the want of what is justly due us, been compelled to discontinue the paper. Desirous to remain permanently in the anti-slavery warfare, and to battle as best we may with pen and tongue for the complete emancipation of our enslaved brothers and sisters, we shall speak to you *weekly* when we can, and *monthly* when we must. Our monthly paper speaks for itself, and we are sure that it will in all respects commend itself to the favor of all who earnestly wish for the downfall of slavery, and the triumph of liberty throughout the world. There will be one advantage to the cause in the change now made. It will leave the Editor more time to labor in the lecturing field. If he writes less, he is resolved to speak more. In this he is sure he will have the sympathy and co-operation of those who will regret most the substitution of the monthly for the weekly. Meanwhile, we earnestly entreat all our friends and coadjutors to promote, as far as possible, the circulation of the monthly. Its size is that most convenient for binding, and we shall take care that its matter shall be such as will be permanently useful and interesting to its readers. Sad will be the day for the American slave when all the old abolition instrumentalities shall be supplanted by those of the milk-and-water, skin-deep Republicanism of this country. After twenty-five years of earnest effort, there is not now a single well supported abolition news-

paper in the United States. This is not because Abolitionists are fewer than twenty years ago, but because they have adopted the suicidal policy of allowing all purely abolition papers to die off, and support only those which mingle either sectarian or political ends with their advocacy of anti-slavery. The conductors of these papers do all of them subordinate Abolitionism to their other aims and ends. A few religious journals like the *Independent*, and political ones like the *Tribune*, are just anti-slavery enough to serve their church and their party. We have faith to believe that a time is at hand when those in this country, who seek not merely the non-extension, but the abolition of slavery, will see and regret the great mistake they have made in the matter, and will return to their old modes and instrumentalities. But whatever may be the events of the future, we are bound, with head and heart and hand, to work as ever for the abolition of slavery.

THE CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

At the late meeting of the General Association of Connecticut, on the second day, Wednesday, June 20th, the Rev. HENRY T. CHEEVER, of Jewett City, in behalf of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, submitted the following resolutions:

WHEREAS, The Christian Church and ministry are, in American society, a fountain of influence second to no other in virtue, and capable, therefore, of wielding a formative power over public opinion and practice throughout the country; and whereas, history shows, as lately developed in the Historical Address of Rev. Dr. Bacon, at the 150th anniversary of the General Association of Connecticut, that it was in the year 1779, at the very first session of the Legislature of this State, 'after an address and petition from the General Association praying that some effectual laws may be made for the abolition of the slave trade'—that the slave trade was prohibited to citizens of Connecticut, and heavy penalties denounced against it; therefore,

Resolved, As the sense of this Association, at its 151st meeting, that there is good reason to believe whenever the voice of the ministry and of the church, in all its denominations, shall be heard as decisively against the unchristian practice of slaveholding, and against the iniquitous system of American slavery that began with, and now itself sustains the execrable slave trade, there is good reason to believe that both our National and State Legislatures will respond as promptly as did the Connecticut Legislature of 1779, and will prohibit slaveholding also, as well as the slave trade, by heavy penalties against it; therefore,

Resolved further, That the responsibility of a longer continuance of slavery in the United States rests mainly with Christian churches and ministers, and that the Church Anti-Slavery Society, which seems to have arisen from this deep conviction, should have the earnest co-operation of the friends of freedom and Christianity in its honest attempt to array the churches against slavery, and to procure from them an expression of Christian abhorrence of slaveholding.

In this connection we wish to call attention to certain pregnant paragraphs in the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, at its late anniversary in Boston. The Report says:

Your committee are especially gratified in reporting that a greatly increased attention is being given in the religious journals, in the

churches, and in ecclesiastical and ministerial associations, to the great principle inculcated by this Society, of refusing Christian fellowship to slaveholders, and of exclusion from the Christian Church for the practice of slaveholding, on account of the inherent sinfulness of holding human beings as property, which defines, and in which consists the crime of slaveholding.

And although a distinguished Doctor of Divinity, at a late public meeting in the commercial metropolis of our country, has defied the moral sense of Christendom, by boldly declaring that he had himself bought and sold slaves, and under similar circumstances, would do so again; that he preached these views from his pulpit, and that being a slaveholder was not a matter of controversy or Church recognition—yet would that Minister and his like-minded associates of the Old School Presbyterian Church, feel, ere long, the scathing condemnation of the Church universal, if they did not already experience the withering contempt of all the surviving manhood of the country.

Your committee are compelled to add, that in their view, it is such utterances and such an attitude toward slavery, taken by leading representative ministers, editors of "Observers," and elders, in different parts of the country, North and South, that is doing more than all other causes together, to bring the Church and the ministry into contempt among the people, if not to carry many of them by the mere force of repulsion, from such a slaveholding semblance of Christianity, into the, at least, humane embrace of modern infidelity. The question is worthy of grave consideration, whether the real infidels and infidel makers of our country and time, are not to be found in some of the boasted oracles and seats of orthodoxy.

We do not think it is a question at all, but it is a simple matter of fact, that 'oracles of orthodoxy,' like the New York *Observer* and certain 'schools of the prophets' that might be named, are the most prolific manufactories of infidelity now in operation in all America; and they will continue to be so, till either the churches rise and repudiate them, or the people extinguish them. We think there is more likelihood of the latter just now, although the bare introduction of such resolutions as those reported above, before an Association boasting of its age, its orthodoxy, and its conservatism like the Congregational Association of Connecticut, looks like the beginning of better times, and as if some in the ministry and the churches were beginning to be sick of the practical infidelity that has prevailed among them. May God help the men *inside* the church that are moving against the infidelity that has well nigh made the church and the ministry a laughing stock to those *outside*!

—Since the foregoing was penned, we learn that the General Association of Connecticut (Congregational ministers) have indefinitely postponed the anti-slavery resolutions introduced by Rev. HENRY T. CHEEVER by an unanimous vote. The same thing would possibly have been done by an association of gamblers, pickpockets and men-stealers in the country; but we doubt if a convention of atheists would have thus ignored the claims of humanity. It takes religious men, especially Congregational ministers, thus to turn a deaf ear to the cries of four million slaves. The action of this Evangelical Association is highly instructive.

HON. GERRIT SMITH.

A highly characteristic letter from Mr. SMITH will be found in the columns of our present number. Like all his many letters on reformatory subjects, it is distinguished by an earnest love for the oppressed and plundered class of his countrymen, whether, like the drunkard, they may suffer from their own self-imposed bondage, or like the slave, they may be the protesting victims of the brutal lust and the satanic power of other men. Mr. SMITH in his letter groups drunkenness and slavery, slaveholders and rum-sellers, the anti-slavery cause and the temperance cause, all together, and applies the same principles and reasoning to all alike. If we were disposed to criticise a letter which, in many respects, is admirable, we should begin just at this point. Things radically distinct and different are confounded, and only confuse and mislead the reader in regard to them. We have no partiality for drunkard-makers, but there is a distinction, ocean wide, between those stigmatized as drunkard-makers and those who hold their fellow men in slavery. Bad as is the sale of ardent spirits, it whitens into innocence when compared with the traffic in men, women and children. Nor are we prepared to affirm that the prohibition of liquor selling is an equal duty with the prohibition or abolition of slavery. In assuming the contrary, as Mr. SMITH evidently does, he employs arguments which, while entirely true and applicable to the anti-slavery cause, fail in their application to the prohibitory temperance movement. Most manifestly the present low condition of the temperance cause is far less ascribable to the manner in which temperance men have voted, than to the almost total abandonment on the part of such men of the moral and social instrumentalities which years ago, made temperance a mighty power in the State. The Maine Liquor Law, as it is called, has almost proved the death of the temperance cause. It has swallowed up all other instrumentalities for banishing drunkenness from the world. Temperance men embarked and invested all their faith, hope, zeal and activity in promoting the enactment of a prohibitory law. They looked to it, evidently, as the consummation of all their labors. How fatal the mistake. The failure of the law has completely prostrated all the moral forces which hitherto had kept life in the conscience of the people against dram-shops and drunkenness. Well as we have thought, and still think, of a faithfully executed prohibitory law, we have never been blind to the fact that a law prohibiting a man from making himself a slave, and dooming himself to misery, is a very different thing from a law prohibiting one man from forcing another man into bondage. One is the voluntary act of a moral and responsible being, and the other is the crime of one man against another. Failing, as we think, to appreciate this distinction, Mr. SMITH has weakened the force of his argument against the folly and wickedness of voting slave-catchers and slaveholders into office.—He confounds a manifest duty with one which is involved in doubt, and about which there is a wide margin for an honest difference of opinion. For one, we are for allowing the temperance and anti-slavery questions to stand upon their individual and respective legs.—Looking at slavery as the hugest and wickedest violation of justice and humanity which now

meets us in the field of reformatory exertion, we should certainly not require as an indispensable condition that a man should be a prohibitionist before we could be brought to vote for him. If sound on the question of slavery, though unsound on the Maine Law, it might be a plain duty to give him our suffrages and elect him to office.

We find also in this letter, Mr. SMITH's well known heresy in respect to the character, position and relative innocence of slaveholders.—He compliments BELL, BRECKINRIDGE, HOUSTON and DOUGLAS in terms, if not of the highest eulogy, far higher than should fall from the lips or pen of a stern denouncer of slavery, and far higher than they deserve. If Abolitionists would make their rebukes tell upon the guilty conscience of the slaveholder and his abettors, they must be consistent.—The amiable and beautiful characters which Mr. SMITH ascribes to BELL, BRECKINRIDGE, HOUSTON and DOUGLAS, were not seen from the standpoint of the slave, under the lash, and robbed of his earnings by these beautiful characters. Mr. SMITH sees them as they appear in their intercourse with the wealthy, refined and princely gentleman of Peterboro'. These pre-eminently mean robbers of their kind, who in one breath threaten death to any man who would deprive them of what they consider their liberty, yet enslave the black man with complacency, had no chains for his limbs, no whip for his back, and no brutal threats for his person—therefore, they are amiable and beautiful characters. For our part, we like Senator SUMNER's painting of these gentlemen better than the portrait drawn of them by our friend GERRIT SMITH.

As to the main object of this letter, which is intended to throw light on the path of duty in the present canvass, Mr. SMITH has taken the true ground—the one upon which the battle with slavery must ultimately be fought out, if the system of bondage be not reserved for a field of blood. Great sins are laid at the door of the Republican party and its candidates, and they are such as make that party unworthy the support of all genuine Abolitionists. Yet we cannot refuse the admission that that party is now the great embodiment of whatever political opposition to the pretensions and demands of slavery now in the field. It is so recognized by the slave power of the country, and a victory by it in the coming contest must and will be hailed as an anti-slavery triumph. In view of this fact, we have no sympathy with those who regard all the parties alike, and especially those who go so far as to prefer the defeat of the Republican party at the coming election to its triumph. Whether the Republican party shall prove true or treacherous to freedom when it gets into power, we at least desire the change. If it betrays the little anti-slavery committed to its trust, the way will be all the more open to the re-organization of a genuine anti-slavery party, which with the Republican treachery and failure before it, will be duly warned against a similar treachery.—Whereas, if it only redeems a part of its pledges, great good will have been gained to the cause of the slave by its elevation to power.

—A negro slave who had been whipped severely by his mistress, in Gilmer County, Ga., during the night cut two of her children's throats and fled.

THE PROSPECT IN THE FUTURE.

The future of the anti-slavery cause is shrouded in doubt and gloom. The labors of a quarter of a century, instead of culminating in success, seem to have reached a point of weary hopelessness, so far as Radical Abolitionists are concerned. The great work of enlightening the people as to the wicked enormities of slavery, is well nigh accomplished, but the practical results of this work have disappointed our hopes. The grim and bloody tragedies of outrage and cruelty are rehearsed day by day to the ears of the people, but they look on as coolly indifferent as spectators in a theatre. The dangers to our common country produce as little emotion as the revelation of the wrongs of our common humanity. They assent to all the horrid truths which reveal the inhuman secrets of the gloomy prison house, but are not moved to action. They commend the iron-linked logic, and soul-born eloquence of Abolitionists, but never practice the principles laid bare by the one, or act upon the emotions called up by the other. An able advocate of human rights gratifies their intellectual tastes, pleases their imaginations, titillates their sensibilities into a momentary sensation, but does not move them from the downy seat of inaction. They are familiar with every note in the scale of abstract rights, from the Declaration of Independence to the orations of CHARLES SUMNER, but seem to regard the whole as a grand operatic performance, of which they are mere spectators. You cannot relate a new fact, or frame an unfamiliar argument on this subject.—Reason and morality have emptied their casket of richest jewels into the lap of this cause, in vain. Religion has exhausted her volleyed thunders of denunciation upon the head of this gigantic crime, but it stands unmoved and defiant. She has poured out floods of the tears of love and sympathy before this people, but their hearts have never been so melted as to produce an appropriate response to her divine ardor. Art, literature and poetry have all expended their treasures to arouse the callous hearts of the American people to the duty of letting the oppressed go free, and yet four millions struggle out their lives in blood-rusted chains. Europe is rocking and heaving with the struggle for liberty, while America is comparatively indifferent under a system of bondage more terrible than Europe has known for centuries. GARIBOLDI lands on the coast of Sicily with a few hundred men, as the forlorn hope of Italian freedom, and a brave and generous and appreciating people flock to his standard, and drive the tyrant of Naples from his bloody throne. JOHN BROWN takes up arms against a system of tyranny more cruel and barbarous than that of the murderer of Palermo, and is hung on a Virginia gallows, while thirty millions of people, whose civil catechism is the Declaration of Independence, look on unmoved to interference.

What is the explanation of this terrible paradox of passing history? Are the people of this country of an inferior race? Are they lacking in physical courage? Do they fail to appreciate the value of liberty? Our history, if we shall confine its revelations to the descendants of the Anglo-Saxon, the Teutonic, or the Celtic races, answers all these questions in the negative. This conglomerate people, made up from the crossing of all

these races, have shown great courage and patriotism in defending *their own freedom*, but have utterly failed in the magnanimity and philanthropy necessary to prompt respect for the rights of another and a weaker race than those mentioned above. It is not because we fail to appreciate or lack the courage to defend our own rights that we permit the existence of slavery among us, but it is because our patriotism is intensely selfish, our courage lacks generosity, and our love of liberty is circumscribed by our narrow and wicked selfishness, that we quietly permit a few tyrants to crush a weak people in our midst. Whoever levies a tax upon our Bohea or Young Hyson, will find the whole land blazing with patriotism and bristling with bayonets the next morning. Let the mightiest maritime nation on the globe but impress a few Yankee sailors, and our merchant ships will be punctured with port holes, and manned with sailors who fight like heroes. Let any power on earth claim sovereignty over a single rood of the scraggy pine woods of Maine, or a foot of the drifted sand of some island on our western border, and Congress will burst forth with such a flood of pyrotechnic oratory as to stir our warlike blood to the tune of battle. But millions of a foreign race may be stolen from their homes, and reduced to hopeless and inhuman bondage among us, and we either approve the deed, or protest as gently as 'sucking doves.' Our courage, our love of liberty, our statesmanship, our literature, our ethics, and our religion, are all most intensely and wickedly selfish. Our national character fails to present a single fulcrum for the lever of justice or humanity. We only ask to be permitted to enjoy our own heritage, and on this condition are content to see others crushed in our midst. Ours is the philosophy of CAIN. When God and humanity cry out against the oppression of the African, we coolly ask what of it? 'Am I my brother's keeper?' If his blood cry to us for redress, we say, 'let it cry; it is not our blood.' If his children are stolen and enslaved, we look on and say 'they are not our children; don't you see their noses are flat and their hair curls.' If his daughters are debauched, our blood remains cool, for they are neither our daughters nor sisters. If his wife is stolen, we have nothing to do so long as our wives are protected by law. If the way to heaven is open to the white man, and we have a chance to 'land our souls in glory,' we are sublimely indifferent to the fact that the Bible and the Gospel are withheld from the negro, and go on shouting our amens, and singing our anthems so loud that nobody but God can hear his wail of agony above the din of our voiceful, but heartless piety. Heaven help the poor slave, whose only hope of freedom is in and selfish hearts of such a people!—Nor can heaven help him, except by moving him to help himself. The motive power which shall liberate the slave must be generated in slavery itself—must be generated in the bosom of the bondman. Outside philanthropy never disenthralled any people. It required a SPARTACUS, himself a Roman slave and gladiator, to arouse the servile population of Italy, and defeat some of the most powerful armies of Rome, at the head of an army of slaves; and the slaves of America await the advent of an African SPARTACUS.

There is one element of American charac-

ter which has as yet never been fairly appealed to in behalf of the slave. Our philanthropy melts itself away into maudlin tears at the story of his wrongs. Our sense of justice kicks the beam when his master's cotton bales are in the adverse scale. Our religion whines and snivels over his sufferings, but cannot leave its formal devotions long enough to bind up his wounds. Our politics bellow in his behalf on the stump, but only employ his cause as a stalking horse for party effect, and to carry self-seekers into power. But there is a latent element in our national character which, if fairly called into action, will sweep everything down in its course. The American people admire courage displayed in defence of liberty, and will catch the flame of sympathy from the sparks of its heroic fire.—The strength of this trait of character has been long manifest in the reception of the patriots who have been cast upon our shores from the wrecks of European revolutions; and when some African EUNUS or SALVIUS shall call the servile population of the South to arms, and inspire them to fight a few desperate battles for freedom, the mere animal instincts and sympathies of this people will do more for them than has been accomplished by a quarter of a century of oratorical philanthropy. We can never cease to regret that an appeal to the higher and better elements of human nature is, in this case, so barren of fitting response. But so it is, and until this people have passed through several generations of humanitarian culture, so it will be.—In the meantime the slave must continue to suffer or rebel, and did they know their strength they would not wait the tardy growth of our American sense of justice.

To the negro-hating conservative this language sounds harsh and vengeful, no doubt. But that same law-and-order conservative reads of the glorious deeds of GARIBALDI and the Sicilian insurrectionists, with a shout of responsive enthusiasm springing to his lips, and rejoices at the downfall of the tyrants of Naples. The cruelties inflicted by the brutal police of FRANCIS II., are reproduced every week on hundreds of plantations in America, and a people far outnumbering the Sicilians are crushed under the heel of a democracy which is far heavier than that of any crowned and booted Bourbon. Why should we shout when a tyrant is driven from his throne by GARIBALDI's bayonets, and shudder and cry peace at the thought that the American slave may one day learn the use of bayonets also?

REV. GEORGE B. CHEEVER.

This intrepid and faithful minister of the gospel—who, during the last four or five years, by his searching exposures of the sinful nature of American slavery, and his stern denunciation of all slaveholders and their guilty abettors, has drawn upon himself the fiercest maledictions of all that is rotten in our pro-slavery religion, and corrupt in our politics—sailed for England on the 14th of July. He will be followed over the perilous waves of the Atlantic with the curses of the traffickers in human flesh and their sneaking apologists—for he is a special object of real hate to them. Could these have their way, he would be given to the whales and sharks before reaching the middle of the Atlantic.—Cursed by slavery and all its guilty prophets, he will be followed all the more by the bless-

ings of those who are ready to perish. The chained bondman will send petitions to the Hill of Zion, that the valued life of their champion may be preserved amid all hardships and dangers which await him, by sea or by land. We understand that our respected friend has a two fold object in visiting Great Britain. He goes for health, and also to help the cause of truth. He will unmask American slavery and its supporters, both in Church and State. We wish him an earnest and hearty God-speed in both objects. His health is precious. Rev. GEORGE B. CHEEVER stands comparatively alone. His, has been the voice of one crying in the howling wilderness of our pro-slavery religion, 'make straight the way of the Lord.' Every British abolition heart will warm toward him, and every British abolition hand will be promptly extended to him. But slavery has its minions in England as in America, and he will there, as here, have his positions assailed, his motives questioned, his good name reviled, his judgment impeached, and his influence crippled in every way that pro-slavery malignity can devise. He will nevertheless carry with him the friends of the slave in England. No man, better than he, can expose the abominations of slavery, or more fully unfold to the Christian people of Great Britain the deep complicity of American churches and ministers with our great national sin.

THADDEUS HYATT.—The liberation of this gentleman from prison must be less regarded as an act of grace, than as a confession of a blunder, from the bad effects of which his slaveholding persecutors were anxious to free themselves as speedily and as gracefully as possible. The speech of Mr. SUMNER on the motion to set Mr. HYATT at liberty, ably set forth what the Senate may and may not rightfully do. It clearly demonstrates that while that body has a right to protect itself, and to claim all things essential to its existence, it has no right whatever to force individual citizens from the four quarters of the Republic to 'aid' the Senate in making the law. He has shown that the power claimed by the Harper's Ferry Committee is as unconstitutional as it is obviously dangerous to individual liberty. Mr. HYATT's liberation is a complete victory over slavery and usurpation; and though he has suffered much while in prison—less, perhaps, from being deprived of his liberty, than from the cold indifference with which many of his brother Republicans regarded his imprisonment—he ought to feel, as he doubtless does feel, that he is amply compensated by the result of his imprisonment in its benefit to the cause of liberty in the Republic. The respect, esteem and gratitude of the whole North are due, and we think will be accorded to THADDEUS HYATT for the firm, fearless, manly and faithful manner in which he has met the requirements of constitutional liberty and those of his own conscience. He has suffered much, but has conquered and gained much by refusing to bend. He bravely exposed his head to all the vengeance which the slave power could wreak upon him, and he comes forth as unharmed as the Hebrews came forth from another furnace of fiery trial set up by a tyrant.

—Dr. J. J. G. Bias, a prominent colored citizen of Philadelphia, died at his residence in that city two weeks since.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

It cannot be denied that the anti-slavery sentiment in the Northern States is the vital element of the Republican party. To make that party indifferent to that sentiment, and to place it in opposition to it—assuming for the party a character opposed to anti-slavery agitation, opposed to negro equality, to negro advancement, to negro suffrage, to negro citizenship, and to negro emancipation—is not only treason against the slave and the black man, but a fatal attack upon the very life of the party itself. Nothing is plainer than that the Republican party has its source in the old Liberty Party, which, beginning twenty years ago with but a handful of members, (among the most able and distinguished of whom was MYRON HOLLY, a citizen of this town,) it increased in eight years from ten thousand to sixty thousand, as simply and strictly an anti-slavery or Abolition party.—In 1848 it fused with the Free Soil party, and was all the life that party had, aside from the hope of place, power and spoils. Out of this Free Soil party has come the Republican party, and it is thus in its origin, history and pretensions, the anti-slavery party of the country, and must live or die as the abolition sentiment of the country flourishes or fades. For the members or leaders of this party to attempt now to create a new character for it, to make it a mere negation in the politics of the country, is to deprive it of more than half its dignity, and render it as despicable as the BELL and EVERETT party, the main boast of which is, that it has no political principles whatever, and that it needs none. We repeat, anti-slavery positive opposition to slavery is the main and all-sustaining element of the Republican party.

It is true that opposition to slavery is supported by different reasons: One man is opposed to slavery because it is an expensive and a non-remunerative system of labor, impoverishing the States and the communities where it is established. Another opposes it because it creates in the slave States an aristocratic class, who despise labor, who, living upon compulsory toil themselves, naturally look with contempt upon all others who, unlike themselves, work as all men must work for an honest living. A third reason is found for opposing slavery in the fact that those whose interests are mainly involved in the slave system, have endeavored, and with great success, to make the sentiments, ideas, principles and practices of slavery dominant and controlling over the whole country. They have sought to make themselves the masters of the United States, as they have succeeded in making themselves the masters of the slaves in the slave States, to give to the free States the manners and morals of the slave States, and to make themselves permanently the governing class of the country. Another motive for opposing or seeming to oppose slavery, is found in the fact that white men have an aversion to blacks, and that introducing the blacks into a new territory, practically amounts to the exclusion of the whites from that territory. Motives of this character, with others even less honorable to human nature, no doubt exert an influence and form an element in the great tide of opposition to slavery, and all contribute to the general probabilities of the success of the Republican party in electing its Presidential candidates

this Fall. But the great and vital opposition to slavery, that which gives life and power to all other forms of opposition to the slave system, however ignored or denounced by Republicans and others, arises out of the fact that the slave is a man, clothed by the eternal God with the full dignity of manhood—a being of moral and intellectual powers, rights, duties, and responsibilities, and that to enslave him, to make of him, as slavery must, a beast of burden, strip him of his rights, shut against him the golden gates of knowledge, load him with chains, separate him from his wife, sell his children, cover his back with stripes, and doom him to unending slavery, is a most atrocious and revolting crime against nature and nature's God, to be immediately repented of and abolished forever. Without this mighty conviction—this just estimate of the nature and character of slavery itself, as a system of warfare upon all rights, and as the stupendous auxiliary of all wrong and violence—all other motives for opposing slavery and its extension would naturally decay and die out. That abolition element, that which sees a brother in the blackest slave, and feels with him the sting of the slave-driver's lash, as bound with him, is the main support of the Republican party. All else is weak, and standing alone is worthless.

Among the statesmen of the Republican party, none seem to understand this better than Senator SUMNER. He has dared to recognize the negro as a man, and as a man to hold him up before the Senate and the nation as a wronged and imbruted human being—one in whose degradation the whole of humanity is insulted and degraded. He has denounced the cherished institution of human flesh-mongers as a system of brutal barbarism, and poured down upon it a holy torrent of moral indignation, sufficient to loose the tongue and fire the hearts of all who shall go forth this Fall to do battle for the Republican cause.—Let all such read, study and appropriate that speech—follow its lead before the people.—Banish the miserable twaddle about standing for the rights of *white men*, about *white equality*, which nobody calls in question or purposes to endanger, and take your stand upon the eternal principles of justice and human nature. Teach the people for once in a political campaign the sacredness of human rights, the brotherhood of man, and expose to all the living light of day the foul and terrible abomination of Southern slavery, and your Republican party will deserve success, which is better even than success itself. The present campaign must either strengthen or weaken the abolition element of the country, and it is for Republicans to say which it shall be.

Of one thing we are unfeignedly glad, and that is, that no professions of loyalty to the South, no pledges to carry out that foul and merciless abomination of the Fugitive Slave Law, no expression of contempt for the rights of negroes, no bowing or cringing to the popular prejudice against color, will win for the Republican party the support of genuine pro-slavery men, or avert from the party the odium of being the advocate and defender of the negro as a man and a member of society. The interests of the party, as well as whatever principle and character it has, call upon the members of it to step promptly to the side of CHARLES SUMNER, and assume towards the whole system of slavery the solid and com-

manding attitude taken by him in his great speech in the American Senate, and which the Massachusetts Legislature has so nobly backed up in a series of resolutions, which we elsewhere publish in our present number.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

This political organization is now hopelessly divided and broken up. During the last twenty years of its existence, its constant aim has been to discourage all anti-slavery tendencies in the country, to exalt and strengthen the slave power, and to make the rapacious traffickers in the bodies and souls of men the permanent rulers and law-givers of the land. It has been regarded at the North and at the South as the natural ally of slavery, and its life has fully justified the estimate placed upon its character. If the negro should discriminate between the various organized forces of this country against him, he would point to the Democratic party as pre-eminent in unscrupulous malignity and heartless cruelty. Attracting to itself all that is low, vulgar, coarse, brutal and mobocratic in the nation, it has poured down upon the negro all these elements of wrath and poison. The vital element of the party has been hatred of negroes and love of spoils. With a name altogether attractive to the masses, and a long period of uninterrupted strength and prosperity, its leaders and managers, like all others thus conditioned, began to think the party immortal. In every division of opinion, in all the contests of factions, the quarrels of greedy and aspiring candidates, hitherto the party has at the trial hour been found united and strong. The Whig party crumbled under the sturdy blows of the Abolitionists, and went to its own place, having outlived its usefulness eight years ago; but the Democratic party stood firm and united, impressing its enemies, as well as its friends, with the idea of its firmness and indivisibility. The illusion is now dispelled. Babylon has fallen. In sight of the whole nation, she has been doubly rent in twain, and utterly demoralized. The details of these transactions are known to our readers, and we need not stay to recapitulate them. We wish only to send up a jubilee shout over the fact that the wisdom of the crafty has been confounded, that the counsels of the wicked have been brought to naught, and that the Democratic party, the bitter and malignant persecutor of our sable race, has fallen mortally wounded in the house of its friends in Baltimore. The condition of the scattered factions who still cling to the name of the party, makes it almost certain that ABRAHAM LINCOLN and HANNIBAL HAMLIN will be President and Vice President of the United States in 1861.

THE FIRST OF AUGUST.—The anniversary of West India Emancipation—the great event which will in after ages distinguish our century from all preceding and after-coming ones—will this year, as last, be duly celebrated in Geneva. The members of the committee of arrangements are bestirring themselves in advertising and securing speakers for the occasion. REV. H. H. GARNET and FREDERICK DOUGLASS have already promised to be present, and we doubt not that other speakers will be on the ground, and will gladly utter their earnest words for freedom on this grand abolition day. Geneva is a very beautiful village, and very easily reached from all parts of the State of New York.

GENTLEMAN.

A very interesting and spicy debate occurred in the Senate Chamber a few days ago, on a rather novel subject. Two grave Senators gave that body a luminous manifestation of their ideas of the qualities which go to make up a gentleman. One of them objected to the reception of a petition, because it was offered by a Senator who had previously offered to the Senate a prayer from the colored men of Massachusetts, and a Senator from the Old Bay State very properly intimated that such an objection was unworthy of a gentleman; whereupon the objector declared, point blank, that the Massachusetts Senator was not a gentleman. Several very similar debates have occurred in the House during the session, and as the question 'what constitutes a gentleman?' is becoming one of the leading political questions of the day, we feel impressed with the growing gravity of the subject, and being desirous to keep up with these fast times, we propose to say a few words on this new political issue.

The meaning of the word gentleman seems to be as difficult to define as that of the word orthodoxy. Its signification depends very much upon the latitude and longitude of the lexicographer, and the habits which obtain in his locality. It is a trite but true witticism, to say that 'orthodoxy is my doxy, and heterodoxy is your doxy,' if you differ with me; and it is equally to the point to say that the manners of a gentleman are my manners, and that all who differ with me are vulgar clowns, whatever my manners and habits may be. At least this seems to be the practical feeling in the United States Senate, as well as in general society.

A great difference of opinion exists as to the appropriate dress, character, habits, and manners of the gentleman. Not a few of the tribes of this globe scorn to wear any other clothes than the closely fitting suit which great mother nature gave them at birth.—Many of the very 'first families' in the oldest settled, and therefore most aristocratic portions of the globe, regard a shirt, coat or pantaloons as equally vulgar and unbecoming a gentleman, and refuse all other clothing than an occasional 'dressing,' of oil, which not only 'maketh the face to shine,' but causes the entire person to assume a lubricated glow. It is related of the king of the Mosquito coast, that his court dress, which he donned on extraordinary occasions only, consisted solely of a palm leaf hat, and a pair of spurs. In this royal costume, he showed himself to his admiring subjects as the first gentleman in all his dominions. It is also affirmed that certain missionary teachers in Africa, had a hard struggle to so overcome the prejudices of 'the first families' in their school district as to induce them to dress the grown up boys at all before they came to school, and in the end they only succeeded in getting them to slip on a long calico sack, made like a bag, open at both ends, with holes for the arms, and these were all hung up in the porch of the bamboo school house at night, and slipped on again in the morning before they entered, for no 'gentleman' would be seen out of doors in that country in such a vulgar plight as to wear a shred of clothing. Dr. LIVINGSTONE tells us, that being desirous of gaining the distinction of a presentation at court at the capital of one of the kings who rule in Central

Africa, he applied to the usher for his kind offices on the occasion, and was told, with half concealed scorn, that the king did not admit criminals to his audience chamber. The Doctor resented the insult, and asked an explanation, when the interpreter informed him that a black suit was the mark which thieves and malefactors were compelled by law to wear in that country, and the Doctor being a clergyman, was dressed in black coat and white necktie. The 'real ould Irish shintleman of the olden time' used to make a stunning impression at Donnybrook Fair in a crownless hat, and with well ventilated knees and elbows, flourishing a stout shillelah as the climax of a fashionable costume; and there is now lying before us a drawing of those matchless gentlemen who compose the Japanese Embassy, in which they appear in a costume which is a cross between the old Dutch petticoat and short gown, and a modern bloomer, and with caps on their heads not made in the image of 'any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.' Senator MASON, who would order pistols and coffee instantly if any body intimated that he was not a gentleman, came into the Senate some time ago dressed in a whole suit of Virginia homespun. So you see, dear reader, although the question of the fitting dress for a gentleman has been agitated ever since the first Nomad stole the coat of the Bear and applied it to his own shoulders, it is not yet settled.

The same difference of opinion exists as to the proper food of a gentleman. The 'King of the Cannibal Islands' would undoubtedly feel it incumbent upon him as a gentleman, to set the choicest morsels from a dish of a baked missionary before his guests, while the Arab would insist upon waiting for his company to make the first dip with his bare fingers into the bowl of stewed mutton, from which the entire family fish up their breakfast. The French gentleman regales you on frog soup, while the root digger would offer you the biggest tubor he had found during the morning's digging.

The same, or even greater uncertainty seems to exist on the question of the moral character and habits of the gentleman. A certain Captain HENRY made his way to the rooms of Senator SUMNER, a few nights ago, and in language not by any means choice or delicate, informed that Senator, that he, with certain associates, had come for the purpose of cutting his throat. The Mayor of Washington, not being quite able to understand the gentlemanliness of throat-cutting, investigated the matter, and insisted that the gentle Capt. HENRY should apologize to the Senator. The apology consisted in excusing himself on the gentlemanly plea of having been drunk, and was climaxed by the assertion that a stream of gentle blood, three hundred years old, flowed in Capt. HENRY's veins. Now, on the supposition that this man's ancestors were Thugs, trained up in the aristocratic circles of Thugdom, where throat-cutting is the amusement of the higher classes, Capt. HENRY's assertion of his gentle lineage is clearly explained, and the Administration which continues to employ drunken, throat-cutting Capt. HENRY in the Patent Office, is not to be blamed, for he is a gentleman, although he does get drunk, and does threaten to murder Senators. We once heard a Southern clergyman eulogize PRESTON

BROOKS as a gentleman, although he assaulted and nearly murdered an unarmed man with a club. Nay, we believe that Southern ladies in platoons of crinoline, put up whole rows of vermilion lips for PRESTON BROOKS to kiss, as a reward for having nearly murdered one of the ripest scholars, profoundest statesmen and most finished orators in America, thus showing their appreciation of this Carolina gentleman. Senator CHESNUT rose in his place the other day and applied to a brother Senator language so foul and brutal, that it would have startled all Billingsgate to have heard it; but Senator CHESNUT is a gentleman. Senator WIGFALL gets drunk, and voids maudlin nonsense and blasphemy by the hour; but he, too, is a gentleman. The united Democracy, with that pink of chivalry, ROGER A. PRYOR, at its head, pour out a whole broadside of epithets such as come only from an Irish fish market, or an Alabama slave pen, upon Mr. LOVEJOY, who is a clergyman; but these Democratic Congressmen are all gentlemen. The standard of gentility in the South is the number of black men and women who have been robbed and plundered by the candidate for social distinction. Up here at the North, gentlemen are so far behind the times as to pay their hostlers. In the South no man is counted a gentleman who does not steal his hostler's wages and all. Here, when gentlemen eat a dinner, they are so vulgar as to pay for its having been cooked. There, the more aristocratic practice of taking another man's wages to buy the raw material, and then hunting down a cook with dogs and guns, to dress the dinner, generally prevails in the best society. Here, living at the expense of others is called pauperism; but in Tennessee, hanging upon the ragged shirts of a dozen poor negroes, as the only means of getting board and clothes, is the very height of gentility. In the North, gentlemen rely on facts and arguments to carry their point in debate; but in Virginia, the revolver and the tar bucket are the highest style of gentlemanly logic.

If to be a gentleman means to return to the barbarism of the dark ages—if this social distinction is gained by utter carelessness of human suffering, and utter annihilation of human rights—if the graces which the term is supposed to describe consist in trampling upon the poor and crushing the weak, then our Southern type of manhood is entitled to bear the palm, and Senators MASON, FITCH, WIGFALL, PRESTON BROOKS and Capt. HENRY are gentlemen *par excellence*.

THE CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT.

The Democratic party having split in two, there are now no less than four candidates in the field for the Presidency, as follows:

REPUBLICAN TICKET.

President—Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois.
Vice do.—Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine.

NORTHERN DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

President—Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois.
Vice do.—Herschel V. Johnson, of Georgia.

SOUTHERN DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

President—John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky.
Vice do.—Gen. Joseph Lane, of Oregon.

OLD GENTLEMAN'S TICKET.

President—John Bell, of Tennessee.
Vice do.—Edward Everett, of Massachusetts.

INDEPENDENT TICKET.

President—Sam. Houston, of Texas.
Vice do.—Commodore Stockton, of N. Jersey.

'IMPUTATION.'

The old mother of Presidents has raised some very touchy and spunky boys. They will never listen to an 'imputation' against their maternal ancestor, without bristling for a fight. They protect the maternal reputation with revolver and rifle. Let any one but stare at the matronly old Commonwealth, and they are ready to call him out. Should a Northern man but wink at her, he would find some of her torpedo-like boys ready to explode in his face instantly. Even her actual practices must not be mentioned in public.—Her sins must be cloaked. Her immaculate purity must be taken for granted, whatever she does. A striking illustration of this feeling was exhibited in the Baltimore Convention. Mr. GOULDEN of Georgia made a speech in that Convention, in which the following passage occurred :

'Here is my old native State of Virginia, the slave-trading and slave-breeding State of Virginia. [Laughter.]

'DELEGATE FROM VIRGINIA—I call the gentleman to order. He casts an imputation upon Virginia, by calling her the slave-breeding State of Virginia.'

Now, we are not quite sure as to what is meant by 'casting an imputation.' We are a little 'obfuscated' by this Virginia terminology. We shall be obliged to resort to Webster's Unabridged for light. Turning to page 587 of that 'sectional and incendiary publication,' we find the following :

'IMPUTE—To reckon to one what does not belong to him.'

This leaves us even more 'dumfounded' than before. It does not shed a ray of light upon the matter, but does cover it with gross darkness. Every body knows that Virginians raise Africans of all hues,

—'From pearly white to sooty'—

and do offer them in the market at all prices, and do pocket the money for which they are exchanged. We have seen specimens of nearly every hue of this variegated and marketable commodity running off to Canada on two legs, and under the apprehension that a white father, or a half-brother, or some other *sub rosa* relative was about to dispose of them, or part with them, or traffic in them, or make merchandise of them, or—well we give it up. We were struggling after a word which would express the idea of selling them, without using a term which a Virginian might regard as an 'imputation'; but our dictionary is broke, and we shall be obliged to risk a duel, or borrow a phrase from Gov. SEWARD's speech, and call it turning them into 'capital.' We all know that human flesh and blood is one of the chief exports of the Old Dominion. It is not merely African flesh and blood which is exported, but flesh and blood of the F. F. V.'s; sons of high officials, descendants of ex-Governors, are now and then turned into 'capital.' These facts cannot be hid, and are patent to all the world. From these facts it follows (as clearly as a child born of a black Virginia slave follows the condition of its mother, although its father might have been Governor of 'ye' ancient Commonwealth) that to call Virginia a slave-breeding, slave-trading State, is not an 'imputation' according to the definition quoted from WEBSTER. The statement of Mr. GOULDEN is literally true—in fact, almost the only statement in his speech which can be called true. It must be, therefore, that WEBSTER is

in the fault. The great Unabridged Dictionary came from the North, and as it differs with Virginia terminology, it ought to be burned in the streets of Richmond, in company with HELPER's book, the Multiplication Table, GREELEY's almanac, and SPURGEON's sermons. Imputation ought to be used in the theological sense in Virginia, in calling the innocent guilty, and the guilty innocent. It is on this principle of imputed, but undeserved righteousness, alone that Virginia can be saved. All her hopes rest upon this marvelous doctrine of imputing purity to unmitigated scamps. She evidently regards her own righteousness as 'filthy rags,' and her sons very properly insist that notwithstanding everybody knows that she is covered with such rags from head to foot, all the world shall keep dark about it, and insist that she wears a robe of purity.

It must not be inferred from this that a Virginian regards it as disgraceful to breed slaves for market. Such an inference is belied by the general practice of her first families, her statesmen, orators and divines. They engage in the business without scruple. Her beautifully variegated population proves this, and of course the business is honorable, for these are 'all honorable men.' The crime involved in this matter consists in speaking about it. It is quite honorable for a Virginian to steal his cook's baby, and sell it by the pound, but an 'imputation' against the Commonwealth to speak of it. He is not ashamed to sell the beauty of his octo-roon daughter or half-sister to the highest bidder, or on private terms; but he will fight you if you call him a slave-breeder. His chivalry is not at all affronted at the idea of selling the sons and daughters of his nursing mamma, whose bosom he shared in infancy in common with them; but the 'imputation' of being a slave-breeder makes him as fierce for a fight as any knight of olden times. It is pretty and poetical to say that 'a blush is the sign of virtue'; but it is not always true.—Who has not seen one he knew to be a thief resent the application of that term to himself, with a virtuous fierceness unapproachable by an honest man. The cyprian is ready to shoot him who 'casts an imputation' upon her virtue, while the really virtuous are bowed to earth by a slander. It is on the same principle that these hotspur Virginians resent the 'imputation' of Mr. GOULDEN against their State. They hope to cover up the poor old lady's sins by kicking up a wordy dust which shall blind the eye of history.

THIRTY-TWO YEARS IN THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

Long acquainted with him by his letters and his labors, we are very glad to have become acquainted with JONATHAN S. GREEN personally. It is not often that such an example as his can be met with. A life of thirty years of toil—toil in a strange land, and among a people of strange speech, the hardest kind of toil, (that which wrings from the brow the reluctant thought-sweat, and which only comes forth when the soul is fired by a love of God and man,) has left our friend GREEN yet hale, hopeful and joyous.—Into such a man's face it is good to look.—It very greatly cheers younger toilers for the good of mankind in their labors, when they see such men. We want less to know what

are the opinions of a man at fifty, than what sort of a man he has himself been made by his opinions and his works. If a man's work is commended by the man, the man is equally commended by his work. Our missionary friend GREEN, with his cheerful spirit, and his warm sympathy with the oppressed, is a praise to his vocation. Some how or other, his life among the heathen during thirty-two years seems to have done more for him than the same length of time and association in this Christian country has done for thousands of so-called ministers of the gospel. The letters of Mr. GREEN to his friend GERRIT SMITH, which we have gladly published from time to time in the columns of our weekly paper, puts him out of the circle of those sneaking hypocrites at home, whose religion consists in making prayers and selling negroes, and equally from among those who, while professing great love for mankind generally, entertain at the same time a most bitter and malignant prejudice against all the darker colored children of men. Mr. GREEN not only loves the white man and the Indian, but his heart is also full of ardent sympathy for the enslaved and hated negro. In this respect, as in others, he is a worthy brother of BERAH GREEN, of Whitesboro'.

Mr. GREEN is just now doing much to awaken an interest among the American people in the people of the Pacific isles. Connected with the American Missionary Society, he is spending his time and strength in promoting its objects. Without stopping to enquire whether we agree or not with the speculative religious opinions of such a man, we commend him as a firm and faithful worker for the redemption of mankind from the power of sin and death, whose gloomy legions are confined to no country, clime or color.

THE VETO OF THE HOMESTEAD BILL.

The dying Administration shows 'the ruling passion strong in death.' The veto of the Homestead Bill by the President is one of those acts of party malignity which it requires a mean soul and a little mind to perform.—One is accustomed to expect some limitation of mere party spite to be shown in the conduct of the Chief Magistrate of a great nation. But we are being made familiar with such disgraceful exhibitions of the littleness of human passion, as the descent of a Supreme Court to the level of a party caucus, and the sinking of a Chief Magistrate into the character of a vengeful political partisan. We have more respect for the poorest man who trundles a wheelbarrow on the public works, who is honest in his calling, than for a President of the United States, who forgets the value of a great measure of national justice and benevolence, under the blinding influence of party revelge. Why could not the misguided old man, who is now President, go out of office with some small title to decent respect still clinging to his falling fortunes? Why should he do the gratuitous work of sinking himself still lower by interposing his veto against a measure which would have carried gladness to a million of hearts? He had covered himself and his party with odium long ago, but this last act of tyranny and spite sinks him into contempt, and will give him such a place in our political history that his countrymen will blush for the man who could sink the President in the passion of political revenge.

A JUDGE IN A FIX.

Judge JAMES THOMAS, of Georgia, has met with a calamity, as will be seen by an advertisement in another part of our paper. He has lost his man BEN. BEN took the law into his own hands, or rather heels. He went off under a private writ of *habeas corpus*, obtained from the court of heaven, without waiting to give due notice to the court of Judge THOMAS. We believe that the writ was made out by a Mr. HUMANITY as Clerk, an attachee of 'higher law' courts not yet introduced into the sandy and swampy Commonwealth of Georgia. BEN was the body servant of Judge THOMAS, and traveled with him all over Georgia attending court, and it is quite probable that the Judge owes his present calamity to this fact. The court room is a bad atmosphere into which to introduce such goods and chattels as BEN.—He seems to have carried about with him the largest share of the brains owned by the Georgia Judge; and that, chattel as he was, he should finally devote these brains to a little private speculation on his account, seems but natural, and ought to have been anticipated. He must have heard many declarations of the principles of abstract human rights, even in a Georgia court; and as he probably never read the Dred Scott decision, he seems to have applied these principles to his own case. It is quite probable that he read over law papers to the Judge when out of court, and looked up the legal authorities on which that learned functionary based his decisions; and as the Judge declares in his advertisement, that there is no man in Georgia equal to his man BEN, it is very plain that BEN was competent to draw an inference applicable to his own case, and 'on that hint he acted,' going *leg bail*, which Judge THOMAS is compelled to accept.

There were other associations besides those of the court room surrounding BEN, which must have contributed to his flight. His master lived in *Sparta*. The very name of his native town was, therefore, an abolition suggestion. How could a *Spartan* be expected to remain a slave. Who has not heard of Spartan love of liberty, and Spartan valor? And Sparta is in *Hancock County*, named after the arch 'freedom shrieker' JOHN HANCOCK, who presided over that Convention of rebels against 'law and order,' who framed that 'incendiary document,' the Declaration of Independence. JOHN HANCOCK wrote his name at the bottom of the document in letters so large as to make a line nearly across a page of foolscap! How could it be expected that such a man as BEN, who the Judge says 'surpasses any man in the State, white or black'—how could it be expected, we say, that the peerless man of Georgia would remain a slave in *Sparta, Hancock County*? You ought to have known, oh! learned and disconsolate Judge, that court room speeches, and historical associations with Sparta and HANCOCK, would in time corrupt even BEN, although you declare his character 'has been spotless.' But it is sad to think that the man who 'surpasses any man in the State,' with a character 'heretofore spotless,' should become so suddenly depraved as to run away, and from a Judge! What is this world coming to?—What is Sparta, Hancock County, Georgia, coming to? Nay, what is BEN, the 'unsurpassed'—BEN, the 'spotless,' coming to?—

It is our private opinion, oh! tearful Judge, that he is coming to Canada; and if he should come on that branch of the U. G. R. R. which runs through Rochester, we shall be most happy to meet him. We should be delighted to make the acquaintance of the peerless, 'unsurpassed' and 'spotless' man of Georgia. We are confident that the superintendent of this branch of the U. G. R. R. would give him a free pass to Suspension Bridge, after first entertaining him in a manner worthy of the 'unsurpassed' and 'spotless' man you judicially declare him to be.—Yes, Judge, be assured that your lost BEN, for whom you mourn by this time 'as those that have no hope,' shall be 'arrested' if he comes this way, and detained long enough to get a good night's sleep and a warm breakfast, and if he should leave us his daguerreotype, you shall see it when you come this way, for it would give us pleasure to let you view the 'shadow' of BEN, now his 'substance has fled.' BEN is undoubtedly a *Spartan*, and FROM HANCOCK Co. a long way by this time.

THE ANGLO-AFRICAN.

We publish elsewhere a commendatory notice from the *Anglo African*, less because we feel that the praise it bestows is deserved, than because of the heartiness with which it is rendered. It will be a very great day for the cause of our common advancement, when colored men shall generally hold up the hands of each other in works for the common good, and put away forever the contemptible idea that one is higher in proportion as he succeeds in sinking another below him. The article in the *Anglo-African* proves that those are liars who say that colored men are incapable of appreciating the labors of their fellows in a common cause, and deny the race, the sentiment of patriotism. Gratefully acknowledging the kind and not, we hope, entirely undeserved notice of the *Anglo-African*, and heartily rejoicing in its ability and prosperity, we must at the same time disclaim and entirely disapprove any attempt to place us, or our friends, in the attitude of complaining of either the liberality or illiberality of Hon. GERRIT SMITH. The facts stated by the *Anglo-African* are mainly true; but it is no fault of Mr. SMITH that the improvement in the size and appearance of our paper, which he enabled us to make by freely giving us twelve hundred dollars, failed to make the paper popular and bring it a larger support. It was on his part a noble and well intended effort to put the then only colored newspaper in the U. S. on a footing of usefulness and respectability with the best weekly papers in the country. That it did not succeed, is less to his discredit than our own. Exaggerated stories of immense sums of money given us by Mr. SMITH, set in motion by those who have desired to find an ignoble motive for our agreement with his opinions, have no doubt injured the paper in many quarters; but on the other hand, the fact that GERRIT SMITH honored us with his friendship and his confidence, has greatly sustained and strengthened us for many years past. We cannot, therefore, accept even the hearty compliments of the *Anglo-African*, without at once severing from its kind and friendly sentiments everything like murmuring against one of the truest and wisest friends the cause of the negro ever had in this or in any other country.

PROGRESSIVE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO.

At a meeting of the Progressive Library Association of Chicago, held June 11th, the following proceedings were adopted:

The Progressive Library Association utterly condemn the course of any and all persons who would seek notoriety at the expense of the colored man. We are opposed to all schemes, the object of which is the expatriation of our people, be they under the guise of emigration, civilization, colonization, or otherwise, save as advised by Frederick Douglass—viz: emigration *en masse* from ignorance to knowledge. America is our home, and we abide in the belief that though justice be tardy, we will yet enjoy the rights of man in this land. Our forefathers who fought and bled in the struggles with England, both for liberty and the honor of our flag, will yet have their hopes redeemed. It is with pride, though not without sorrow, that the colored man looks back to the battles of Bunker Hill, Lexington, Guilford, and other bloody fields, the correct history of which has never been written. 'Truth is mighty and will prevail.' The true history of this country will yet be written, wherein the colored man will be seen as he was and is. We will 'labor and wait.' We favor our people going any and everywhere their good sense and inclination may dictate, as individuals, but we oppose a relinquishment of their homes in a body or otherwise.

The above has been called forth by the appearance of a letter in the New York *Tribune* of a recent date, over the signature of a Mr. Harris, advising expatriation to the colored people. He asserts that his actions are under the indorsement of all the whites, whose favor he courts, and all colored persons of worth and intelligence in the United States. He casts indignity upon the colored people of the West India islands, whom he proposes to civilize, christianize and instruct in the principles of political economy and self-government—ignoring the fact that those people are far in advance of the colored people of the U.S. in everything, save perhaps ignorance. Now, while we wish to investigate all subjects, particularly those in which the colored man is immediately interested, we condemn this mode of making a parade before the public through an unfriendly press; and it is a notorious fact that the weight of the American press favors colonization for the colored man.

Resolved, That the letter of Mr. Harris in the New York Tribune is both mischievous and impolitic, and so far as receiving the indorsement of all colored persons of intelligence and worth, we emphatically deny.

Resolved, That these proceedings be spread upon our journal, and published in Frederick Douglass' Paper.

H. O. WAGONER, Pres't.

W. R. BONNER, Corr. Sec'y.

THE NEGROES IN CANADA.—A correspondent who has recently visited Canada writes as follows concerning the negroes settled there: 'I went with a view of examining the country and the condition of the people of color. It is currently reported all along the Southern border, and of course in the "interior" of the South, that the colored people in Canada are in a suffering and even starving condition. Being a Southron myself, I knew the value of this report to Slavery, and as I am opposed to all lying I was determined to find out the truth of this matter. And I am prepared to say from personal observation and from personal interviews with reliable men from different parts of Canada, that the report above mentioned is utterly false! The country is fine, land yielding splendid crops, and many of the colored people are amassing wealth. All parties testify that the colored man's condition is as good as that of any other emigrants. Why should it not be?—Except Slavery has paralyzed his manly energies! There is a prejudice of color among the whites on the ground of social equality; and so far as I could see and hear, both white and colored discourage any attempts at amalgamation of the races.'

LETTER FROM HON. GERRIT SMITH TO FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

PETERBORO, July 13th, 1860

FREDERICK DOUGLASS: MY DEAR FRIEND:— I am frequently asked what the friends of Temperance and Freedom should do at the approaching Election. My answer is the same as that which for so many years I have given to the same question. *They shall vote for the uncompromising enemies of the dramshop; and for those who, knowing no law for slavery, accord not the least legality to its least pretensions.*

The cause of Temperance is prostrate— Who prostrated it? Its professed friends.— How? By trifling with it, and trampling it under foot at the polls. By voting for candidates whom they knew to be in favor of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. No man, who believes in the rightfulness of such sale, is fit for any political office. For the sole legitimate end of every such office is protection of the people: and hence they, and they only, who love to be and study to be their protectors, are fit for such office. But are they such protectors, who license the dramshop, that manufactory not of drunkards and paupers only, but also of madmen, murderers and every other sort of criminals? Certainly not! As well might we elect slaveholders to political office. And how unfit they who buy and sell people are to be entrusted with the protection of the people, does surely not need to be argued.— Nevertheless these friends of Temperance, yielding to other interests and partaking of the frenzy of party politics, rush to the polls to vote for drunkards and drunkard-makers. The rumrunner himself is not a more responsible drunkard-maker than is he who licenses him. And if here or there is an earnest man, whose conscience sternly forbids such prostitution of suffrage, he is scoffed at by these friends of Temperance as a fanatic or a fool. They are ever proclaiming that the dramshop is the greatest of all curses:—and yet they are ever voting to maintain it. Is this their matchless infatuation or their amazing hypocrisy?

A like treachery explains the like low condition of the anti-slavery cause. Abolitionists have from year to year voted against it, until at last, there are fewer Abolitionists than there have been at any time within twenty years. The mass of those, who were once intent on abolishing slavery every where, do not go now for its abolition any where. The calculating policy of non-extension has taken the place of the uncompromising principle of abolition.

In the year 1844 more than sixty thousand men voted for James G. Birney. They would have refused to do so, had he not been opposed to the returning of fugitive slaves; to the continuance of slavery in the District of Columbia; to the continuance of the slave trade between the States; and to the admission of slave States. But ere four years had gone by another spirit had entered into them: and now even Martin Van Buren, with all his pro-slavery sins upon him, was fit to be voted for by men, who had so recently consecrated their votes to that repentant slaveholder—that sublimely pure and just man—James G. Birney. Of these sixty thousand, probably not one thousand would now demand in their candidate the qualifications which they demanded in 1844. Who of all the sixty thousand would have voted as he did, had Birney avowed himself in favor of a white man's party, or of any however slight discrimination against the black man in the whole multitude of political rights? But now how very few of them all would withhold their votes from their candidate because of such an atheistic avowal on his part? I say *atheistic*—for what is plainer than that he who makes it does not believe in the God 'who made of one blood all nations?' Very few of the sixty thousand but would now denounce a candidate as foolish or fanatical for placing himself on any of those high grounds on which Birney stood forth so openly and firmly and nobly. Now the sixty thousand call for cun-

ning in their candidate. Then they insisted on integrity. Then the candidate must be grandly moral as well as grandly intellectual in order to be worthy of their votes. Now he must know how to shape his creed to the popular favor, and be skilled in contrivances to get votes. Thus increasingly rapid are the downward steps in morals.

What a mighty host would the sixty thousand have become had they not fallen into the fatal error of giving up truth for numbers!— They were impatient for success—not knowing that they already had it, and would continue to have it so long as they adhered to principle. For not only is it true, that such adherence works out and surrounds itself with every success, but that it is itself the highest form of success. The sixty thousand had grown from seven thousand in four years. A far less rate of progression would have put the Government of the country into their hands long ere this time. Evil was the hour in which they listened to the proposal to purchase speedy victory at the price of their principles. The price was paid. But no victory and no good came in return. Thanks for the eternal ordination that no good can be purchased at such price!

The retrogradation of Northern Legislatures in respect to slavery illustrates the decline of Northern sentiment on that subject.

Vermont is acknowledged to be the most anti-slavery of all States. But would her present Legislature resolve by even a bare majority in favor of abolishing the inter-State slave trade; or slavery in the District of Columbia; or in favor of refusing the admission of new slave States? The disastrous effect of such Resolutions on the coming Election would be an effectual plea against them.— Nevertheless in 1838 her Senate voted unanimously in favor of all these, and her Assembly by such an overwhelming acclamation, that no negatives were called for.

The only Anti-Slavery to be found in any of the present parties is an unsteady opposition to the establishment of slavery in a Territory. Occasionally surrendered it must be also occasionally renewed to the end that an apparent, albeit well-nigh infinitesimal, difference may be kept up between the Republican and other parties on the question of slavery. A Republican voter needs to hear and say something now and then against Territorial slavery, not only to prevent others from confounding him with a Douglas Democrat, but to preserve the hair's breadth difference in his own consciousness. At every other point than this of Territorial slavery all the parties allow slavery its full swing. And how inconsistent and vain would be even an earnest and steady opposition to slavery at this point, if accompanied, as the present vacillating opposition is, by the admission that slavery may exist in a State—yea, in every State! For what is slavery but the practically asserted claim of property in man? And if the rightfulness of that claim in a State is conceded, it is virtually conceded in a Territory also. What is property any where is property everywhere. That 'what the laws make property is property' is one of the things in the big bundle of atheisms.— Property makes necessity for laws: but God alone ordains what is property. To the school of great Nature, and not to the enactments and conventions of men, are we to go to learn the elements and subjects of property. That Government may authorize the destruction of property in cases where it has become a source of actual or apprehended evil, I do not deny. But I do deny that this admitted power affords, as some maintain, ground for the claim that Government can transmute into property that which is not property, and can look away from the light of nature, common sense, and common law to determine what is property. Perhaps instead of saying that Government may authorize the destruction of property, I had better said that it may authorize the destruction of that in which the rights of property are already forfeited or lost.

Would then any political party consistently and effectually oppose the introduction of slavery into a Territory, it must recall every ad-

mission it has made in favor of the lawfulness of slavery in a State. At this point of Territorial slavery the anti-Squatter Sovereignty Democrats have on the score of consistency an immense advantage over the Republicans and Douglasites. If a man be property in a State, it follows that he can be rightfully carried as property into a Territory. These Democrats make themselves strong by adopting this inference, and their opponents weaken themselves by rejecting it. But these Democrats would make themselves far stronger, if they would push their consistency further, and insist on the right to carry this man-property not only into any Territory, but into every State also. And they will yet come to this, and bring the nation to this, provided the Abolitionists do not succeed in the mean time with their counter doctrine that man is property no where. Either Jefferson Davis or Wendell Phillips is right. All between them, be it Mr. Douglas or Mr. Lincoln or whoever else, are wrong. If the being, made in the image of God, may be a slave any where, he may a slave every where: and if not every where, then no where. Vice President Breckinridge in his Letter of Acceptance just now published—a Letter by the way evincive of the high order of his cultivated mind—says: 'Nothing less than sovereignty can destroy or impair the rights of persons or property.' A sound proposition this, were the words 'less than sovereignty' omitted. But a very unsound proposition is it, which sets sovereignty (human laws) above Nature and God. The rights of persons and property stand in Nature and God: and every invasion of them is sacrilege. The one legitimate function of Civil Government is to protect these rights in all their original fullness and sacredness. But the Vice President is a slaveholder, and in self-defence he must assert the power of Civil Government to destroy the rights of persons. So too he must assert its power to destroy the rights of property, and to abolish slavery. For to abolish slavery is, as he holds, to destroy those rights: and he clearly sees that if Civil Government cannot abolish slavery, then upon his own principle it cannot create it.

The Vice President has made a mistake.— The only position at this point on the side of slavery, which he could have taken with consistency, he has failed to take. In one breath he makes property in man to be as full as property in any thing else—as property 'of whatever kind.' In another breath he admits that the State can abolish property in man.— What if his State should undertake to abolish property in the matchless blue-grass fields around his Lexington, and in the highly improved breeds of cattle, that graze upon them—would he not resist such abolition?— From what I personally know of his spirit and intelligence, I venture to affirm that none would be before him in declaring that God and Nature have said what is property, and that there authority is paramount to that of Kentucky. To have been consistent then he should not have admitted the right of the State to abolish property in man. He has admitted a distinction between slave property and other property; and if not so wide as that the Republicans claim, nor even so wide as that acknowledged by the Douglasites, sufficiently so nevertheless to give countenance to each, and to deprive his opposition to each of the dignity and force of a contest for a principle. The only contest for a principle at this point is that, which the Abolitionists are waging against Republicans, Democrats, Douglasites and all other enemies and despisers of human rights. The sound Abolitionist tolerates in no circumstances the claim of property in man. He respects God, and cannot consent to sink to the level of brutes the being made in His image.

President Buchanan in his Speech of last Monday asks what he 'as a Pennsylvanian would say or do' in case it should be contended that a Territory could outlaw iron or coal. And I ask him what he would say or do in case Pennsylvania herself should attempt such outlawry. If he is still a man—if the

politician has not yet entirely consumed the man—he would promptly resist his State, and scout the idea of her power to strike down the rights of property. But, Mr President, you did consent to her abolishing slavery—or, in other words, to her abolishing property in man. What then becomes of the basis doctrine of your Speech—that property is property—and that property in men is as sacred as any other property? The rights of property are as inviolable and indestructible as those of person:—and the justification of Pennsylvania for abolishing slavery is that she therein touched no rights of property!

Just here let me say that the parties vastly overrate the importance of the petty issues between them. The battle is to be fought between the Slaveholders and the Abolitionists: and it will be fought just as soon as these parties, that block the way, get out of the way. The result will be, not this or that condition, this or that liability, of a Territory: but a Nation all overspread with slavery, or all emptied of it. The result will be to give the lie to the 'Declaration of Independence,' or to honor its great doctrine, that 'All men are created equal.'

It is true that many members of the Republican party believe slavery to be unconstitutional wherever the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction. But they all acquiesce in the proposition that this Government has no right to array itself against slavery in the States: and nearly all would accept the logical sequence that this Government is bound to protect State slavery from all foreign aggression. In a word, all the parties believe that the North is pledged by the Constitution, not only to return the fugitive slave, but even to march South for the defence of slavery. Truly, this is being pledged to the perpetration of enormous wickedness! For my own part I do not see that this pledge exists. But the North does: and hence her only wise and Christian course is to entreat the South to liberate her from it either by consenting to change the Constitution at this point or by consenting to let her, the North, go out of the Union. Surely, the people of the South will not insist that we shall continue to trample upon our consciences and kill our souls by contributing to uphold a system, which, however innocent it may be in their eyes, is in our own more full of injustice to man and dishonor to God than any other on earth. Let the South do to the North as in an exchange of circumstances, she would have the North do to the South. What if the Northern States should adopt the policy of enslaving her light-haired people, and the South should then be holding as she does now, in common with the North, to the doctrine of the absolute right of a State, as against the National Government, to do what she will with her people!—she would, of course, regard herself as constitutionally bound to uphold this policy. How deeply desirous therefore would she be to be released from all responsibility for it! For she would believe it to be an exceedingly wicked policy. Yet, what more wicked is it to enslave people because of their light hair than because of their dark skin?

I believe the Constitution to be anti-slavery. I believe, that it imposes no obligation upon me to uphold and fight for murder in Maryland or for the worse crime of slavery in Kentucky. But Constitution or no Constitution, I would have the North vote slavery to death. The North however believes the Constitution to be pro-slavery, and that whilst it remains unchanged such voting would be wrong.—Again, I would have every slave run away from his master; and I would afford him every facility for his peaceful escape. I would tell him, as I have been telling him these twenty years, to 'take the horse, the boat, the food, the clothing;' and to believe in no rights of property any where in the South as against his needs—nor indeed in the North either, so long as it continues to be to him an 'enemy's country.' Let him take what he will, human life alone excepted. But the North, interpreting the right of the slave-

holder to his slave to be a constitutional right, and holding every constitutional right to be sacredly inviolable and paramount to every other right whether in earth or heaven, cannot consistently put forth its hand in any way to deliver the slave.

I repeat then that the North, taking her at her own view of her obligations, has no other alternative than to cast herself upon the good feeling of the South, and petition for a change in the Constitution or a peaceable release from the Union. The right of such release—be it the release of the North or the South, the East or the West—I argued in my Speech in Congress on the Mexican Treaty. That right I hold to now: and that right I believe the South is just and generous enough to acknowledge. As you are aware, I am as ready to look South as North for justice, generosity and manliness. Do you say that the South is greatly corrupted by slavery? She is: but no more than the North. Slavery is upheld at the South in accordance with education.—At the North in the face of education. The South believes it to be morally right to demand the return of fugitive slaves. The North believes it to be morally wrong—constitutionally right but morally wrong—to return them: and yet returns them. Is not the North then the more wicked—the more corrupted—of the two? Certain is it to my own mind, that the North bears a more corrupting relation to slavery than does the South.

Charles Sumner, that pure and brave and strong and learned man, does, in his Speech of day before yesterday in New York, distinctly convey the idea that the American Union is no more responsible for slavery in Charleston than in Constantinople. How otherwise could he put himself in line with the Republican party? especially after having shot so far ahead of it in his recent masterly Speech in Congress? But, it is impossible for my noble friend to bring himself into harmony with that party. There is not room enough within its exceedingly narrow limits for a soul so great—so expanded by the love of truth—as is his. Even were there ground for his comparison between Charleston and Constantinople, he nevertheless could not be of that party. But there is not the slightest ground for it. The Union is not bound to maintain any sort of Government in Constantinople. But it is bound to maintain 'a republican form of government' in Charleston. It is not bound to put down insurrections in Constantinople. But it is bound to put them down in Charleston. Is slavery incompatible with republicanism, then the Union must put down slavery every where within the Union:—and so must it do if slavery has been or is sure to be the source of insurrections in any of the States. It must not permit the safety of a State, and, through a State, the safety of the Union to be thus endangered by the existence of slavery.

Does Mr. Sumner admit that the Constitution tolerates slavery in the States? Then does he virtually admit that the whole Nation is bound to defend it—ay, in certain contingencies, to fight for it. Or does he deny that it is in the contemplation of the Constitution, that a State may so outrage all just conceptions of 'a republican form of government,' as to set up or continue slavery; or may furnish those rightful materials for 'domestic violence' in which slavery abounds, then also does he virtually admit that the whole Nation is responsible for it—as responsible under the Constitution to abolish it, as in the former case it was responsible under the Constitution to maintain it.

Would that my dear friend might disembarass himself of the few remaining hindrances in his glorious service of the cause of Freedom, and hasten to plant himself by the side of William Goodell, Lysander Spooner, and those other Radical Abolitionists, who hold that the whole Nation is bound to shut out slavery from the whole Nation because the Constitution does so!

I have spoken of the duty of the North in the light of the convictions and admissions of the North. I hardly need say that I shall myself continue to go to the polls with a vote

for men, who are not anti-dramshop men, but who, knowing no law for slavery, treat as nullities whatever Courts, Constitutions or Legislatures may say in favor of it. My vote must continue to be for men who are content with and obedient to the law of heaven in respect to slavery. Increasingly disgusted as I am with the cant of the churches about Christianity, I must nevertheless go for Christianity. I have no knowledge of Christ if it is possible that, in any circumstances, votes for rum men or slavery men can serve his cause or do him honor. I should be glad to vote at the coming Election for names presented by a Temperance or Abolition Convention: and I hope there will be such a Convention. But if there are not enough earnest Temperance men and Abolitionists left to get it up, I will endeavor to compose my ticket without the help of a Convention.

I trust that the stress, which I lay on voting, will not be construed to imply a censure of Mr. Garrison and Mr. Phillips and their noble associates. I still honor, as I always have done, the men who, differing broadly from myself in their interpretation of the Constitution, have conscience against voting under it.

I trust too that I shall not be regarded as seeing no merit in any who vote rum and slavery tickets. Many so vote, 'the lachet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose.' The longer I live the more am I convinced that men may be very good, and yet do things that I think to be very bad.—They do not survey every subject from my standpoint. Again, though their steps, where diverging from my own, may not be as defensible as my own, nevertheless the end they have in view may be as good, and it may be cherished in a warmer and better heart.—Even some of those, whose bad motto is: 'The end justifies the means,' may on the whole be better than some of those who are very scrupulous on the score of means.

To illustrate my position that a very bad deed may be combined with a character in which there is much good—there is nothing that in my eye is more unequivocally the work of Satan than casting back into the pit of slavery the poor brother or sister who has escaped from it. Nevertheless through the blinding power of a wrong education good men are drawn into this Satanic work. I know and respect Mr. Bell and Mr. Breckinridge. No little elevation and beauty of character mark them both:—and yet their life-long connection with slavery reconciles them to the recapture of the fugitive slave. So too from the like cause is General Houston reconciled to it. Nevertheless in regard to the wrongs done the Indian he is as tender as a woman. One can hardly fail in his social intercourse with the General to be pleased with him. Mr. Douglas too would have the flight of the slave arrested: and all the greater is the crime in him from his having been educated in Vermont and New York. But I have seen pleasant things in Mr. Douglas: and a relative of mine, who has long lived near him, told me years ago that Mr. Douglas is eminently kind to the sick and suffering around him.—Alas, even the other Presidential candidate does also stand against, instead of by the side of, the poor, trembling, imploring fugitive! And yet, in respect to Temperance, Mr. Lincoln is reported to have a very clear vision. Moreover, no man has spoken more sublimely than himself on the 'Declaration of Independence.' How painful to see in one, who has so many claims to our respect and admiration, so wide a departure from justice and mercy!—and that too in the very case where justice and mercy are most called for!

But however worthy may be the gentlemen I have named, I must not vote for any one of them. However mitigated may be the crime of their pro-slavery by the misleading forces of their education and circumstances, I nevertheless am not permitted to vote in their darkness, but am bound to vote in my own light. Not their ignorance of the wickedness of slavery, but my knowledge of that wickedness, must govern my vote. My pro-slavery

vote would not be excused at 'the last day' on the ground that my candidate did not know the sin of slavery; but it would be condemned on the ground that I did know it.

Should any one of the five Presidential candidates be elected, and I should see him applying his official powers to give back his brothers and sisters to the horrors and hell of slavery, I should be distressed. But had I voted for him I should die of remorse. For I should feel that his superlatively guilty work was my own—I having made it such in advance by my vote to give him the office, which I well knew he stood ready to use for this most diabolical purpose. In that case the summons of the President for military or naval aid to the kidnappers would be my summons, and the guilt of it would crimson my soul as well as his. For the stripes and tortures, that would await the returning captives, I, as well as he, would be responsible.—Responsible I, as well as he, for their doom of a compelled and unrequited life-long toil. And the thought, that they were no more to have right to husband or wife, parent or child, and no more to be permitted to read the Bible or spell the name of Jesus, would be the excruciating thought, that to this possible and even probable end did I cast my vote, when I cast it for one, whom I knew to be in favor of consigning them to this fate. No, I must not vote for such an one. If others with their views can, I with mine cannot. If there are others who can afford it, nevertheless I cannot. Some there may be whose stock of righteousness is so large, that a balance would be left them even after voting (as does every voter for a slave catching Presidential candidate) to set the whole army and navy of the United States against the innocent fugitive. But I have no such surplus goodness to vote upon: and therefore for me to cast such an unrighteous vote would be to reduce myself to utter and immediate moral insolvency.

Christian! were Jesus again on the earth, would you vote to have him lead the forces for returning the poor slave to the disabilities and tortures from which he had escaped?—The bare proposition is most abhorrent to you. How then can you consent to vote for Mr. Douglas, or Mr. Lincoln, or any other man, who virtually tells you that he is willing to lead them? Has not party spirit blinded you?—Nay, has it not corrupted you? What is too abominable for Christ to do is too abominable for any man to do: and thus would you yourself decide in every case where the spirit of Christ and not the spirit of party prompted the decision.

I said that I must not vote for a slave-catcher. My profession of deep and tender interest in the slave is a life-long one. To turn now and vote against him—to vote that if he escape from chattelhood to manhood, he shall be thrown down again from manhood to chattelhood—would not that be giving an emphatic lie to this profession? Again, when men get to be as old as I am, they have an especial reason for not adding to the number of their sins—particularly of their great sins. Their 'space for repentance' is reduced to a narrow one—too narrow to supply all the penitential tears, which even one such enormous sin, as voting a man back into slavery, calls for.

But I am asked whether I would withhold my vote from a candidate because I foresee one official wrong in him, and yet feel assured that he will be guilty of no other. Certainly, if that wrong is the murdering, or, what is worse, the enslaving of his fellow men. The wrong done to one man is not canceled by right dealing toward even all other men.—Moreover, I am not at liberty to feel assured, that he who is pledged to commit the most flagrant injustice against one man will not, when as strong temptation calls for it, be guilty of as flagrant injustice toward other men.

There is but little hope for either Temperance or Freedom in our day. Too few of their present friends are their true friends—God grant that the next generation may have the wisdom, integrity and courage to vote away the Dramshop and Slavery! But in the

mean time will not our land be more deluged with rum than it is even now? And (fearful question!) will it not also be deluged with the blood of the slaveholder and the slave? It does not follow that because four millions of slaves submit to the yoke, six or eight millions will.

How, indeed, can we hope for either of these great Causes in our day? The friends of Temperance would like to vote against Rum—but they love their parties too well to do so. Politics have a far stronger hold than Temperance upon them. As to Slavery, the North does not dislike it enough to break away from all scruples and all parties for the sake of voting against it: and neither North nor South is willing to come into the amicable arrangement of putting away Slavery by their consenting to share in the present loss of putting away the crime and curse for which both are equally responsible. GERRIT SMITH.

[From the Anglo-African.]

FREDERICK DOUGLASS AT HOME.

It did not require the informal announcement in the columns of *Frederick Douglass' Paper* to assure its readers that the strong hand of its editor was again at the helm.—During his absence Abram Pryne won golden opinions by the terse, strong, and manful style of his editorials—did as well as anybody else could under the circumstances; but no fact in the anti-slavery history of the time has so abundantly proven the truth of the fervent words of Byron—

Hereditary bondmen! know ye not,
Who would be free themselves must strike the blow?

as the history of this paper during the last year. In this slave question, as there can be no vicarious suffering, so there can be no vicarious resistance to slavery. Abram Pryne's strong, rugged essays seize hold of and convince the intellect; the very dashes of Frederick Douglass' pen rain heart's blood, and reach down and stir up every fibre of our being, melt our sympathies, and concentrate again our full-souled indignation against the sum of all villainies.

Wendell Phillips—who seems to grow in mental stature as he grows in years—spoke the other day of 'twenty years of bootless anti-slavery effort.' Why bootless? Because it has not come from the right source—the bond men themselves. In this view, *Frederick Douglass' Paper* grows in its proper importance. It is a voice right out of the depths, an appeal from the very heart of slavery. It is the sufferer uttering his own appeal—the bound partially delivered, the dumb crowned with the power of utterance, the slave once in fact now in deathless sympathy,

Still pealing on unwilling ear
The tale oppression hates to hear.

Men may tire of the repetition of the intellectual horrors of slavery; but the heart-gushings of the slave himself, in bonds or freed, will smite the attention and enlist the heart.

In this view, and not this alone, we bid our brother an affectionate welcome home. We feel a stern joy in finding him once more among us—such joy as warriors feel when, in the midst of battle, they recognize the scarred and grimy face of an accustomed and reliable leader; for we are at this moment in the very hottest of the fight in the country at large, and in our own State more especially.

In the country at large, there are no doubtful indications that the Republican party—the remnant of our nursing mother, the old Whig party—intends to wean us, and has not spared the bitter aloes from the hands of Bates, Lincoln, Seward, and—Greeley. In our own State, promptly before us is the franchise battle, for which we are bound to make a gallant struggle. Hence the arrival among us of Frederick Douglass is most opportune. We look for his stalwart form and lofty plume, and we find them where they should be—in the fore-front of the battle.

But the fight requires men and means as well as leaders. We bespeak for *Frederick Douglass' Paper* the most cordial and earnest support. Let the old subscribers pay

up, and let new ones send forward their names and monies with open heart and open hand.—His paper is an institution with a glorious past, and, we trust, a more glorious future. We have not striven to vie with it in its special mission, because the effort would be hopeless on our part; nor would we if we could. To stir up and keep alive an undying war against slavery and slaveholding; to keep alive in the breasts of black men their especial relations and duties to the bleeding and down-trodden slave; to rebuke the pro-slavery sentiment and conduct of the relatively free North—these are walks which Frederick Douglass, of all other men, especially treads alone—a Macgregor on his native heath! And we hold up both hands, and call upon our brethren to hold up both hands, to support him.

Many years ago, while yet in the ranks of the old organization, Mr. Douglass had the sagacity to see, and the daring to act out to the letter, the fact that the fight against American slavery is the black man's fight.—No sooner convinced was he of this cardinal principle than he acted upon it, although it cost him the sympathy of his hitherto anti-slavery coadjutors, and threw him upon the support of those—the free colored people—who had not then, and have hardly yet, come up to the right conception or cordial support of his platform. In all the intervening years, with the coldness and, sad to say, not seldom embittered opposition of his anti-slavery friends on the one hand, and the luke-warm appreciation of his colored brethren on the other—all these intervening years Frederick Douglass has maintained a straightforward, manly, self-relying struggle, with a zeal, earnestness, and unflinching fortitude worthy of the man and the cause.

It has been not seldom hinted, rather than alleged, that Frederick Douglass had received large pecuniary aid from the Hon. Gerrit Smith. The facts in the case are that some years ago Mr. Smith presented to Frederick Douglass for his paper twelve hundred dollars, but required as an offset an alteration in the size and paid editorial assistance, such as made the gift the opposite of a pecuniary help.—There have been other small donations from the same gentleman, amounting to less than two hundred dollars in the aggregate. Indeed, our noble hearted friend would seem to think—the gifts of this kind which he has made being evidence—that the black man's labor at the press should be on his own hook and self-supporting. We cannot suppress our mortification to see him send fifty dollars to the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, which mocked and jeered at him while recently a candidate for Governor, while he sends only twenty dollars to *Frederick Douglass' Paper*, which largely lost subscribers by supporting Gerrit Smith for Governor in 1858.

Of the circumstances connected with Mr. Douglass' departure for Europe and return home, we say nothing at present. At the time of his departure he asked a suspension of opinion for reasons which he could not then and might never divulge. We have such thorough reliance in his truthfulness, his fidelity to the great cause, his unblenching courage, and undying zeal, that we are assured that he not only did what was best, but also what was wisest and bravest on that occasion. And we gladly record the fact that the trials thro' which he then passed won for him the sympathy, respect, and admiration of such true-hearted men as Wendell Phillips and Edmund Quincy—nay, more, disarmed the hitherto bitter opposition and excited the warm sympathy of Messrs. Garrison and Oliver Johnson themselves.

CORRECTION.—The statement in our last that the Hon. Gerrit Smith had given fifty dollars to the *Anti-Slavery Standard* was incorrect. He simply sent fifty dollars to the funds of the American Anti Slavery Society, through Oliver Johnson, Esq., editor of the *Anti-Slavery Standard*.

—The colored Republicans of Brooklyn a short time since, raised a Lincoln Liberty tree.

WHOLESALE KIDNAPPING.

SIX FREE MEN CARRIED INTO SLAVERY.

NO. I.—KIDNAPPING IN ILLINOIS.

Southern Illinois is about as noted for the operations of slave-hunters, as New York city is as the port of slavers, and Richmond as the mart of slave-traders. Every few days negroes are seized in Egypt and carried off as slaves, without going through any forms of law in justification of the outrage. The *Chicago Press and Tribune* of July 6th gives the following particulars in relation to the kidnapping of three free men from Clifton:

We present below, upon indisputable authority, the facts of the recent and last kidnapping case in this State. We need add nothing in the way of comment. Three men, colored, and suspected of being fugitive slaves, are seized without warrant, or other form of law, and by brute force, without even that farce which the advocates of slavery call a trial before our United States Commissioner, are, despite the exertions of their friends, hurried off out of Illinois, into a slave State, where, unquestionably, they will be doomed to a life of bondage and toil. No such thing as an inquiry, an examination, or trial. The work was accomplished by the aid of bowie knives and revolvers, aimed first at the heads of the trembling negroes, and then at the breasts of their supposed sympathizers and friends. A fast train of cars and a consenting conductor complete the work. Illinois is the poorer by three willing pairs of hands; and some slave State has gained three mute and sullen beasts of burden, who may some day put in practice, at the expense of the man-sellers and kidnappers, the lessons of skill and daring that a life of freedom has taught them. But our concern is not with them. The ingenuity and unscrupulousness of the man-hunters have put them in a place where they will be heard of no more. The lash, hard fare, unceasing toil and spirits broken by bondage will probably shortly do their work. Our care is for the outraged sovereignty of Illinois, for the guards which shall make all such atrocities impossible hereafter, for the guarantees of personal freedom, dear alike to black and white, which this infamy has broken down. What matters it that these men were poor, unfriended, black and suspected of having been born where men own and sell other men? They were under the protection of the State and its laws; they were entitled to the legal presumption in favor of their innocence and freedom. The State has been defied, the laws broken, and the presumption of freedom unceremoniously set aside.

Mr. Kingman's Letter.

CLIFTON, ILL., July 4th, 1860.

Solomon Sturges, Esq., Chicago:

DEAR SIR:—About eight o'clock last Sunday evening, our usually quiet village was visited by a band of the most barbarous men that I ever witnessed. It seems by what was developed at the trial of some of the parties yesterday, that several men from Missouri have had their headquarters at Ashkum the past three weeks or more, where, with the assistance of one George D. Smith, a trader in Ashkum, and a Mr. Cornelius, formerly a Kentuckian, who lives in the immediate neighborhood of Ashkum, they have been working up a plan for several weeks, to kidnap some colored men who have been living in this town. About eight o'clock they had managed to get five of the boys into the 'Sellus House,' where Smith made himself very free in entertaining them, when eight other men armed to the teeth, rushed in and presenting their pistols, told the boys they were prisoners. Two of the most powerful of the boys made a rush, and knocking down several of the ruffians, made their escape; the other three were pounded severely on the head with the butt of their pistols, overpowered, handcuffed, thrown into a wagon and driven off before any alarm could be given, all done in the space of ten minutes. What makes the affair the

more diabolical, is the fact that one of the men carried off never was a slave, and one had been freed by his master, the third one might or might not have been a slave, but little was known of him. It appears from what we can learn since the affair occurred, that one of the boys that escaped probably had been a slave, and that his master was one of the band that figured here.

It appears that this slave owner made a bargain with Smith and Cornelius, of Ashkum, that if they would assist him to take 'Ned,' one of the boys that escaped, they would catch as many more as they could, take them South, sell them and divide the spoils. After the three were taken, they were driven to Ashkum, about four miles, where they were put on the cars of the Illinois Central Railroad Company. There seemed to be a perfect understanding between the kidnappers and the conductor of the train 'much more'—as the cars hardly came to a stop before the negroes were thrust on board, and the train moving. A sufficient number of citizens went on the train from here to prevent the negroes from being put on board, and were fully prepared to have done so, had the train made the usual stop—but before half of the citizens who went on the train could get off to render the required assistance the train was in motion, and as I learn, the kidnapped negroes were taken to St. Louis.

In addition to the nine kidnappers, who were doubly armed with revolvers and bowie knives, the Section men who work on the track of the Railroad Company, for about fifteen miles distant, numbering about twenty-five, were in attendance, apparently to render assistance if needed—all stout, able-bodied Irishmen. I hope and pray that it may never be my lot to witness another such scene.

In haste, yours, truly, J. E. KINGMAN.

In addition to the above, we have the following from an eye-witness:

July 3d.—We have to-day five persons on trial for assisting the kidnappers—three Irishmen of Clifton, and two Yankees (or something else) from Ashkum. We have employed an able lawyer from Kankakee City, and shall give them a thorough examination—Conductor Muchmore on one of the Illinois Central trains, came up this morning and informed us 'that the slaves (?) had been taken to St. Louis,' and he cursed Mr. White for daring to show his indignation at such proceedings, and thus injure the interests of the railroad company! The conductor also stated that 'had any of us interfered, we certainly would have been shot, and that the damned niggers were no better than so many beasts, and he did not consider the Republicans much better.'

Later.—Three of the men on trial have been held to bail in \$500 each to appear at the next term of the court.

NO. II.—ANOTHER CASE IN ILLINOIS.

On the 23d of June, (says the *Chicago Press and Tribune*.) a negro man, accused of being a runaway slave, was kidnapped near Carbondale, Jackson Co., a station on the Illinois Central road, and being brought to the depot by his captor, was thrust into the cars and hurried off South, where, no one knows. There was no warrant or process used in his apprehension, no pretense of an examination into the poor man's right to own himself. The presentation of a revolver and the uttering of a torrent of oaths were sufficient. Afraid of his life, which would have been sacrificed had he resisted, the man submitted and was borne off. During the enactment of what we have so briefly described, a 'Black Republican,' who did not see the propriety, legality or necessity of the proceedings, ventured to ask upon what authority the supposed runaway was arrested, and for the legal process by which the prisoner was being hurried out of the State. A Democratic mob instantly surrounded him, and being unsupported by another voice, he was compelled to retire or risk the consequences of his 'impertinent' interference with the robbers engaged in the nefarious work. Before leaving, an opportunity occurred, and he expostulated with the conductor against his becoming an agent for carrying the man off. 'I take all whose fare is paid,' was the reply; the whistle sounded, and the train was gone. Thus another man has been torn from freedom, and thrust into hopeless and life long bondage; and thus do we record another instance in which the Illinois Central Railroad lent itself to that accursed work—the illegal and forced enslavement of men presumed to be free! Citizens of Illinois, how long shall this thing be, and not arouse you to action?

NO. III.—KIDNAPPING IN OHIO.

We find the following in the Washington (Fayette Co., Ohio) *Herald* of June 28th:

Our village was thrown into quite a flurry yesterday morning between 7 and 8 o'clock, in consequence of the capture of a negro man, by two or three plethoric looking individuals, hailing from Kentucky, assisted by one P. S. Collins, who resides in this village. The circumstances as we learn them are, that the Kentuckians arrived here on the midnight train, and in the morning procured the services of said Collins with a carriage and horses, and proceeded to where the negro lived, half a mile from the village, and Collins went to the house under the pretense of getting a drink of water, which he got, and then asked the others if they did not want a drink; to which they replied affirmatively. Collins then requested the negro, John Marshall, to take the gentlemen some water, which he did, and when he arrived at the carriage, they seized him, when a scuffle ensued—the negro knocking one of the party down, then ran into the house of Tommy Keese, a colored man, where he was staying. They pursued him into the house and forced him into the carriage after he was almost denuded, and drove off with him. The negro had been in this place and neighborhood for four years past, had worked for Judge McLean four years ago, and was at work for him at the time of his capture. He is an industrious, well-behaved man, and was believed to be a free man. The captors may have had legal authority to take the man, but they acted like a set of kidnappers. If they had authority to take him, why did they act like thieves? It was supposed that the men had no authority for taking the negro, and that it was a case of kidnapping. Deputy Sheriff Johnson and Constable M. Blackmore and others went in pursuit of them.

A later dispatch states that the driver of the carriage has been arrested as an accomplice, and held to bail in the sum of \$1,000. The kidnappers having procured fresh horses, had started for the river three or four hours before the arrival of the officers, and their victim is probably ere this beyond the reach of assistance.

NO. IV.—KIDNAPPING IN NEW YORK STATE.

From the *Albany Evening Journal* we learn that one George Armstrong, a free colored man, born in Jefferson Co., in this State, left Watertown a month since, in company with a man by the name of Benjamin, who is a fish dealer. Nothing more was heard from George until July 5th, when his sister received a letter from the firm of Carusi & Miller, lawyers, of Washington City, who say that he is now in jail there on the charge of being a fugitive slave. What his fortunes have been since leaving home, or how he got into his present dilemma, his friends do not know; though they conjecture that Benjamin may possibly have had something to do with it.—On these facts, and others of a satisfactory nature, being made known to Gov. Morgan, he at once caused to be made out the necessary papers and credentials, to authorize and empower Mr. Haddock of Watertown to proceed to Washington to procure the liberation of this free colored man, imprisoned for no other crime, it would appear, than that of being black.

—A recent census in Canada shows that there are 45,000 runaway slaves there.

THE LONDON PRESS ON CHARLES SUMNER'S ANTI-SLAVERY SPEECH.

MR. SUMNER DENOUNCED.

[From the London Times of June 18th.]

Although the great events which are now occurring in Europe receive and deserve our incessant attention, it is impossible not from time to time to turn our eyes to the New World, where problems are to be solved that nearly affect ourselves. It is a part of the destiny of this country that, from its worldwide dominion and universal interests, the concerns of no State are indifferent to it. A Frenchman or a German may concentrate all his attention on what is passing at Palermo, for he has hardly any relations with the world beyond the Atlantic or south of the Equator; we, however, are continually reminded that we are not only a European power, and must sometimes forget the revolutions and intrigues of Europe in observing the career of our own race in newly-settled regions of the globe.—Perhaps the most important foreign question for England is that of American slavery. Our relations with the United States, through trade and community of origin, are so close that it is impossible their moral condition should not affect our own. The rivalry which exists between the two countries makes it difficult to discuss any international subject without the chance of giving umbrage, and yet the feeling of Englishmen regarding slavery is such that even traveling in the Southern States, where freedom of speech may be dangerous, they cannot forbear inveighing against the 'domestic institution.' We have the greatest interest in the decay of this mighty evil. The reputation of this country for wisdom is at stake, for the negroes of the West India colonies were emancipated not only on the ground of humanity, but on the calculation that free labor was more productive than that of slaves. These islands still lie at the threshold of the American Republic, and if the stars and stripes shall ever float over the walls of Mexico and Havana, the British Antilles will be exposed to all the influence of a pro-slavery propaganda. How important, then, is it for us that before those great territorial accessions which seem inevitable actually take place, the system of slavery shall have been modified! That it will come to an end in our time is, indeed, not to be hoped; but that the South should be induced to acquiesce in the principle that slavery is an evil, and ought to be abated, is what every man of humanity ought to desire and work for. Some beginnings of emancipation, some preparation for a gradual change, are not beyond the hopes even of those who have been depressed by the recent legislation of the Republic, and the boldness with which the most extreme opinions are avowed by the Southerners. If such a change were promised, we should see with less uneasiness the progress of American dominion, and not regret that the extension of our language and religion diffused over a larger area the degradation of a subject race.

Whenever there is a lull in the storm of discussion which rages between North and South, we begin to hope for some good in this matter. The freedom of Lombards or Sicilians may be worked out by the sword, and there is no finer spectacle than that of the bold man who makes war against the tyranny which crushes his countrymen. But the African will never be saved by such means. He is too low to rise up as his own deliverer, nor would humanity gain by the substitution of negro anarchy for the present social institutions of the Southern States. The white man must raise him by the aid of white men, and, above all, by the aid of his master. The politician who endeavors to set hatred between different classes of Americans on this subject, who encourages the negro to look to violent means for his deliverance, and fills the owner with increased dread of bloody reprisals by his bondmen, is an enemy to the cause in which he pours forth his acrimonious eloquence. John Brown himself has not done more harm to the cause of abolition in Vir-

ginia than a man like Mr. Sumner, when he drives the Southern Senators to fury by such a violent and uncalled for philippic as our American correspondent notices to day.

It was some years since Mr. Sumner had raised his voice in the assembly to which he belongs. The results which followed his onslaught on slavery are still in the remembrance of every one. In 1856, when the Union was agitated by the contest between Buchanan and Fremont, and party spirit was at its highest, Mr. Sumner delivered an anti-slavery speech almost as strong as that of the other day. A Mr. Brooks, a member of the Lower House, exasperated at Mr. Sumner's language, and perhaps urged on by rowdy friends, ferociously assaulted him while he was sitting quietly in his chair, and inflicted such injuries as endangered Mr. Sumner's life, and forced him to retire for a time from public affairs. Brooks has since gone to his account, and we need say no more of him; but the Senator from Massachusetts has not learnt temperance of language from the incident which nearly ended his days. The speech which produced the assault was offensively acrimonious, but the last one seems entirely to overtop it. The Southern gentry pride themselves on the possession of high and what are called 'chivalrous' qualities. Mr. Sumner, knowing this, makes an oration on the barbarism of slavery. It may certainly be said that a man has a right to stigmatize as barbarous those who defended and even praised his would-be murderer; but Mr. Sumner ought to know that it is immoral as well as unstatesmanlike to provoke men of violent temper, and that by so doing he only presses down the yoke still closer on the neck of the slave. But he puts himself forward as if purposely to aggravate his opponents. Every sneer, every cutting epithet, every provoking insinuation which he can call up, he uses for the purpose of galling his antagonists. 'Slavery must breed barbarians,' he observes; 'it develops everywhere alike, in the individual and in the society of which he forms part, the essential elements of barbarism.' 'Violence, brutality, injustice, barbarism, must be reproduced in the lives of all who live within their fatal sphere.' The master 'shares the barbarism of the society which he keeps,' and so on.

We must, in the name of English abolitionism at least, protest against these foolish and vindictive harangues. Scarcely has the frenzy caused by John Brown's outrage begun to die away, than out comes Mr. Sumner with a speech that will set the whole South in a flame. We can well believe that the prospects of the Republican party have been already damaged by it. Mr. Sumner is one of that class of politicians who should be muzzled by their friends. The man who can in personal irritability so forget the interests of a great cause is its worst enemy. Slavery existed on the American continent long before the assembly of which Mr. Sumner is a member. On it depends, or is supposed to depend, the prosperity of half the Union; the looms of Lancashire and Normandy, as well as those of Mr. Sumner's own State, are supplied by slave-grown cotton, and hundreds of millions of Northern dollars are vested in slave-worked plantations. Slavery, with its roots thus deep in the soil, is not to be rooted up by any peevish effort of rhetoric; and we may predict that the man who first gains a victory for the cause of abolition will be of very different temper to the Senator from Massachusetts.

MR. SUMNER DEFENDED.

[From the London Daily News of June 22d.]

The question was of the admission of Kansas to the Union. Mr. Sumner was not making a speech about the abolition of slavery.—He does not speak as an Abolitionist. He is the leader of the Free Soil politicians—of those who declare that the Southern States have a right to choose their own institutions within their own bounds, but not to force them upon the citizens of other States. On behalf of Kansas the speaker showed the reasons why new States should be spared the inflictions of slave institutions; and among

those reasons is the barbarous character of slavery, which renders it a curse not to be endured in a community which refuses to legalize it.

This was what the Senator had to say on behalf of Kansas. He said it as the Senator for Massachusetts; and in that capacity it was his duty to stand up against the pretensions and encroachments of the pro-slavery minority whose representatives were present.—Instead of preaching on abolition, as *The Times* supposes, Mr. Sumner's aim is to leave slavery in the hands and on the consciences of those who maintain it—plainly refusing to involve the free States in the peril and disgrace of it. Can any writer who asserts the importance of the question to England be unaware that at present slavery is a national institution in the United States, not by the existence of slavery on the whole area, or half of it, but merely in virtue of certain provisions of the Constitution which are the object of a revolutionary struggle at this moment!

In the name of Old Massachusetts Mr. Sumner exhibits the character of slavery and refuses the disgrace and danger of being implicated in it. The barbaric character of slavery, and of its supporters, has been abundantly exhibited through the press of some Northern States; but it has never before been displayed in the Senate, and all criticism of it is excluded from the Southern press, and from most of the Northern. In the progress of the revolutionary conflict the moment has arrived for the truth to be told in the Senate; and Mr. Sumner, as the representative of the most venerable State in the Union, was the man to utter it. He described the character of slavery; he proved its operation upon the liberties of communities and the character of individuals, and he declared the resolution of the free States to get rid of the evil of being implicated in such a barbarism, and to save every new community from being cursed with it against its will.

This was what Mr. Sumner had to say, and not anything which should coax the Southern members to abolish slavery. What they do about slavery is no business of his, or of anybody's, in Mr. Sumner's opinion. The slaveholders are citizens each of a sovereign State. They can set up or maintain what institutions they please, without consulting the opinions of anybody from Massachusetts or elsewhere. They can make themselves as barbarous as they choose; but when they insist on bringing other sovereign States into their boat, those other States have a right, and ought to feel it a duty, to show their sense of the degradation, and to refuse it.

It is no doubt true that, if the free States succeed in eliminating the pro-slavery provisions from the Constitution, slavery will soon become impracticable in the separate States. That is the affair of the South altogether.—All that the North has to do is to refuse to give its name and reputation to a bad institution which is too weak to stand without it. That refusal being once effectually pronounced, the rest is a question between the slaveholders, their landless white neighbors, and their negroes. Mr. Sumner did not address himself to a question which does not lie in his way. We who have, as *The Times* says, such an interest in it, from its bearing on the supply of cotton, may look more directly to that point. The result of all real study of the actual position is a clear conviction that the only way to keep Southern industry alive, and the cotton crop growing, is to introduce free labor without delay. If the negroes were, from this moment, paid in wages the amount that their maintenance now costs, the chance of a continued supply of cotton would be as good as it could be made. If, on the other hand, the South perseveres in its overbearing policy, its speedy doom is certain. At this moment every sensible man unexcited by Southern passions knows very well that it is only a split in the Democratic party, allowing the election of an anti-slavery President, which will save the South from the horrors of a servile war. And what becomes of the cotton then? The insurrection movement which

followed the rejection of Fremont was difficult to deal with; and since that time the slaveholders have aggravated their own peril in every possible way.

It is enough to remind our readers that the negroes have been compelled, in various parts of several States, to flog, to tar and feather, and to burn alive Northern citizens, resident or traveling, on the accusation of being the negroes' friends. What those negroes are now feeling and intending may be left to the imagination of the dullest. If our cotton supply is to be saved, it is not by putting the negroes out of sight, as *The Times* has thought proper to do; nor by admonishing American Senators to speak the slaveholders fair, in order to induce them to think of beginning to prepare for a gradual training for freedom. Addressed to Abolitionists, this sort of notion would be abundantly absurd; addressed to Mr. Sumner, it is wholly irrelevant. Is it possible that anybody is ignorant of the revolutionary condition of society in the United States? Are men to speak smoothly and court delay when their fellow-citizens are put to flight or consigned to hopeless imprisonment in Washington itself by the oppression of the Senate, and when there is a tacit organization in certain States to resist the oppression; and when free citizens are kidnapped and sold into slavery; and when men and women from New England are ruined in their fortunes and tortured in their bodies, and one actually burned alive, all without form of trial, and amidst the exultation of the community in which such deeds are done? When a legislator stands up in his place, and, in discharge of his special duty to his State declares such acts to be barbarism, and the institution which begets them barbarous, is he to be insulted with the imputation of personal vindictiveness?

Mr. Sumner is too well known in England to render it necessary to vindicate him from any aspersions of that kind. It is not in vain that he has passed four years of pain from the assault of a cowardly representative of 'the Southern chivalry,' without uttering a word on his personal grievance, or a moment's intermission of the cheerful magnanimity with which he at once accepted the consequence of his denunciation of a national crime. American oratory is not acceptable to English taste; and Mr. Sumner's speeches are not more liked by some of us than others which come from Washington. But about the self-forgetting patriotism of the man we believe there has never been a difference of opinion on either side the water. If there is not a Southern man in the Senate at Washington who believes Mr. Sumner to have spoken from personal vindictiveness, such a charge on the part of any English newspaper can hardly be of much consequence. But it is of consequence to know that the English people are not ignorant of the occasion, the purport and the object of the speech in question, or of Mr. Sumner's special obligation to speak out when and as he did.

LETTER FROM MRS. L. MARIA CHILD.

WAYLAND, May 25, 1860.

To the Editor of the New York Bee:

I am very much obliged to you for the friendly remarks in your paper of the 19th, prefacing the story you copied from a Georgia paper, concerning a destitute daughter of mine. In reply, it will be conclusive to say that I never had either son or daughter—Moreover, I never heard of any one connected with me, or bearing my name, who was ill, or in suffering circumstances, in any of the slaveholding States.

The story made its first appearance last January, in the New Orleans *Picayune*, written by a correspondent, who pretended to have heard it from some Southern lady. As the editor sent it to me marked, I supposed he wished to ascertain whether it was true; accordingly I wrote to him the same statement I have now written to you. I seldom see that paper, but I have been recently told that my letter was published in it. Two other requests from editors of newspapers I also answered, but in all cases very briefly. I make it a rule never to talk to the public about myself. First, because I suppose they have, or ought to have, something more interesting to occupy their attention. Secondly, I consider it a better employment of my time and energies to defend principles of truth and freedom, than to defend myself. I always admired Lamartine's saying: 'Let our names perish, so that our principles remain.'

In addition to my own statement, the story has been contradicted by several editors. But it still continues to be copied by Southern papers, and by Democratic papers of the North. I presume many of the editors know it to be untrue. But falsehood diligently circulated often serves the purpose of politicians. Those who defend a system so bad as slavery have no great choice of weapons at their command. They betray the weakness of their cause by answering to facts and arguments with noisy threatenings and indiscriminate personal abuse. Yours, respectfully,

L. MARIA CHILD.

OWEN LOVEJOY AT GERRIT SMITH'S.

George W. Putnam writes from Peterboro' to the N. Y. *Tribune*, as follows:

The Hon. Owen Lovejoy of Illinois addressed a very large gathering of the people of Madison County at Hamilton. Messrs. Lansing and Scholefield also made eloquent addresses. After the meeting closed, Mr. Lovejoy, by previous arrangement, took a carriage and came to visit his friend Gerrit Smith. Although the notice of his coming was short, yet at 8 o'clock in the evening an audience of several hundred ladies and gentlemen had assembled in front of Mr. Smith's mansion to listen to a short address from the distinguished stranger.

Gerrit Smith welcomed Mr. Lovejoy in a speech of unusual eloquence. He spoke of the esteem in which he had long held Mr. L.; of his faithful services in the cause of human freedom, and alluded in a most touching manner to the fate of his noble brother, who was murdered by a pro-slavery mob at Alton in 1837. Mr. Smith then introduced Mr. L. to the people, who received him with acclamation. Though quite weary, Mr. L. made a powerful speech of about an hour, upon the principles of the Republican party. He handled the Democracy and Douglas without the least ceremony, and was warmly cheered by the audience throughout the speech. At the close of his remarks a vote of thanks was passed to the speaker. Afterward a large number of the ladies and gentlemen of the place took the opportunity to pay their respects to Mr. L., and spent an hour in conversation under the hospitable roof of his host.

I am not a Republican, but I was pleased to look upon the man who a short time since shook his fists in the face of the insolent slaveocracy in the House of Representatives; and while they cursed, and threatened, and gnashed their teeth upon him, charged home upon them their unbounded villainy, and without faltering portrayed their outrage of all the laws of God and man in the practice of slaveholding, told them of their meanness and wickedness, and charged them with the murder of his own brother more than twenty years since.

If we could also have looked upon the brave Potter, of Wisconsin, who so thoroughly humbled the chivalry in the case of the poor braggart, Pryor, we should have had pleasure enough for one evening.

Gerrit Smith is in more perfect health than for many years past. I have never seen him so vigorous, both in mind and body.

FORTY THOUSAND COPIES OF CHAS. SUMNER'S GREAT SPEECH.—The undersigned has determined to supply the clergy of the country, each man of them, with a copy of this, the great speech of the century. One thousand dollars is required for this purpose. Such friends of freedom as desire to share with me the pleasure of this undertaking, may enclose their subscriptions to my friend the Hon. Samuel E. Sewall, No. 46 Washington street, Boston.

THADDEUS HYATT.

MASSACHUSETTS SUSTAINS SENATOR SUMNER.

The following resolutions have passed both branches of the Legislature of Massachusetts by an immense majority, sustaining Senator Sumner in his noble vindication of free speech in the U. S. Senate:

Resolved, That the Legislature of Massachusetts, in the name of her free and enlightened people, demands for her representatives in the National Legislature entire freedom of speech; and will uphold them in the proper exercise of that essential right of American citizens.

Resolved, That the thanks of the people of this Commonwealth are due, and are hereby tendered to the Hon. Charles Sumner, for his recent manly and earnest assertion of the right of free discussion on the floor of the United States Senate; and we repeat the well-considered words of our predecessors in these seats in approval of 'Mr. Sumner's manliness and courage in his fearless declarations of free principles, and his defence of human rights and free institutions.'

Resolved, That we approve of the thorough, truthful and comprehensive examination of the institution of slavery embraced in Mr. Sumner's recent speech; that the stern morality of that speech, its logic and its power, command our entire admiration; and that it expresses with fidelity the sentiments of Massachusetts upon the questions therein discussed.

Resolved, That His Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit a copy of the foregoing resolves to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from this Commonwealth in the Congress of the United States.

Resolved, That the thanks of the Legislature, acting as the agents of the people, be and are hereby tendered to the Hon. Henry Wilson for his able, fearless and always prompt defence of the great principles of human freedom, while acting as a Senator and as a citizen of the Old Bay State.

Resolved, That this Legislature most cordially support and sustain the course of our Representatives in the present Congress, and heartily endorse their action in upholding the freedom of speech, opposing the introduction of slavery into the territories, and in opposing the corrupt measures of the present National Administration.

SERVED HIM RIGHT.—A year ago last winter, two negro girls, held in slavery in Nebraska, escaped from their master, and as was supposed, crossed the Missouri river into Iowa. Their owner finding plenty of Democrats for the service, organized an armed party for pursuit, and as soon as they were on Iowa soil, commenced breaking into and searching citizens' houses and committing various other offences against the law, order and decency which prevails in a free State. Of course they had no warrant or show of authority. Like the Missouri 'nigger-catchers' in southern Illinois, they proceeded upon the assumption of the white man's divine right to all the darkies he can get, and to catch and hold them wherever they can be found. The girls were not captured; their owner went back minus his chattels, but with a heavy bill for his Democratic posse and their whisky, which in all 'nigger-catching' expeditions somehow is sure to flow. One R. S. Williams, of course a pestilent 'Abolitionist,' who has just enough effrontery to maintain that he has rights that even 'nigger-catchers' are bound to respect, seems not to have liked the proceedings of the marauders. He sued the would-be master, the owner of the flying chattels; and we see by an Iowa paper, that he has recovered eight thousand dollars damages, in full, we suppose, for the insults and injuries to which he and his family were subjected by the barbarous clan. That's good. *Chicago Press and Tribune*.

—Dr Thomas Butts, of Southampton, Va., recently deceased, has directed in his will that all his servants, 105 in number, shall be freed.

SUMMARY.

BURNING AT THE STAKE IN TEXAS.—The N. Y. Tribune has received the following characteristic letter from the Postmaster at Buchanan, Texas, which that paper prints as written:

BUCHANAN TEXAS June the 15th 1860

'I see a communication perporting to have bin written at this place April 25th 1860 and published in the Tribune of May 14th 1860 Said communication has no signature to it, will you be so kind as to give me the name of said Correspondent,

'I feele shure you would not wish to publish any communication that was not true and a man who would write a false communication to impose on a publisher of a paper should be heald responceable to the publisher and to the public You will pleas send me the Name of said correspondant and mutch oblige your obedient sevt

JOHN. P. BAILEY, dty
P. M.

'P S the communication is headed A Man Burned at Stake in Texas'

To which the Tribune replies:—

'We are sorry to refuse so courteous a gentleman anything, but really we are unable to grant Mr. Bailey's request. But unfortunately we don't know him, and can't be sure that he doesn't want the information for some improper purpose. Besides it will be observed that he is very careful not to deny the statement of our former correspondant, whose name he demands. Try again, Mr. Bailey!'

SLANDERED.—Mr. Joseph Newman has been 'slandered'—'shamefully slandered,' he says. He therefore summons to his assistance a friend, and thus tries to set himself right with an enraged public. The following is from a Nashville paper:

'PERSONAL—A CARD.—I have been shown an article in The Home Journal, published at Winchester, Tenn., derogatory to me personally.—I deny ever having even seen a Helper book. I am a South Carolinian; I live two miles from the city of Columbia, where I have a plantation. I also manufacture piano-fortes in the city of Baltimore. I am a thorough-going pro slavery man. I am shamefully slandered by the article in question.

JOSEPH NEWMAN.'

'I have known Mr. Newman for more than twenty years, and firmly believe in the above statement. I have conversed with him many times in his own house and in mine, on all kinds of subjects, and I have never heard him advance an opinion inconsistent with the Southern position which he now assumes. It affords me pleasure to give this testimony in behalf of an injured man.

THOS. O. SUMMERS.

Nashville, Tenn., June 23, 1860.

HELPER IN THE SENATE.—A pretty good 'sell' was perpetrated in the House of Representatives a day or two before its adjournment, by some of its members, who professed to have just returned from the Senate, and asked every one they met if they 'had heard of the excitement in the Senate.' 'Why, no,' would be the reply; 'what was it?' 'The greatest excitement of the season—far ahead of the Haskin affair,' continued the reporters. 'Well, what was it?' eagerly demanded the hearers. 'Why,' responded the relators, 'just as the Chaplain of the Senate was opening with prayer, and got as far as "Oh! Lord, thou art our HELPER"—to the amazement of the Republicans, every Democrat drew his bowie-knife, and exclaimed in a loud voice, "Where is he?"'

EMANCIPATION OF SERFS IN RUSSIA.—So little has appeared on this important subject of late, that fears began to be entertained that the grand movement had met with fatal opposition. A letter from St. Petersburg, May 21st, to the Independence Belge, shows that the process of emancipation is advancing with as much rapidity perhaps as is consistent with the public peace and the general welfare. Serious differences of opinion and of interest have arisen in regard to the mode by which emancipation shall be accomplished. A deputation of the nobility to the capital assent to emancipation, but desire that instead of its taking place at once, they shall have two years within which to arrange its conditions. The plan recommended by the commission created for the discussion of the subject, requires owners to give the emancipated serfs as much land as shall suffice for their support. The Times publishes the St. Petersburg letter and remarks:

'In spite of the formidable difficulties by which it is surrounded, the Emperor persists in the prosecution of this great work, and so far

as the result aimed at is concerned, he is supported by the nobility and owners of great estates throughout the Empire. The wisdom of the measure, its harmony with the Christian spirit and popular enfranchisement of the age, are universally recognized, and there is a general desire in all quarters to promote its success.'

'BURYING' THE CAPTURED AFRICANS.—From intelligence received here, (says the Washington correspondent of the Tribune) there is reason to suspect that the alleged mortality among the captured Africans at Key West, is only a sham to cover nefarious designs, which has been successfully practised in some cases. The solemn mockery of carrying coffins to sea for purposes of pretended burial is well understood, and they do not always contain dead men. Suspicious vessels have been prowling around Key West with the intention of carrying off parties of these poor creatures, and it is believed that many of them have already disappeared, who are now working on plantations in Alabama and Mississippi. Some of the pirates engaged in the slave trade prefer a descent upon Key West to the hazards of a run to the coast of Africa and back. As Congress made provision for the removal of these negroes long ago, it is properly asked why the President has allowed this delay, if he intends to execute the law. The cry is now got up in Florida that they do not desire to be removed, as if in their ignorant and wretched condition they were competent to decide such a question. The papers of Alabama approve of the kidnapping, and one says that they could be very easily taken by a few determined men, and 'that act would be quite as moral as the Government's robbery of the first purchasers.'

THE LATEST KENTUCKY IMPUDENCE.—Gov. Magoffin, of Kentucky, the Executive who does nothing to protect the mobbed anti-slavery citizens of that State, or to punish the kidnappers of Ohio citizens, recently made a requisition on Gov. Dennison, of Ohio, for the surrender of Willis Lago, charged with the offence against the laws of Kentucky, of having 'seduced and enticed Charlotte, a slave, the property of C. W. Nichols, to leave her owner and possessor, and of aiding and assisting said slave in an attempt to make her escape from her said owner and possessor.'

Gov. Dennison submitted the papers to the Attorney General for his official examination, who for good and sufficient reasons duly set forth, reported to the Governor, that the offence charged against Lago 'does not rank amongst those upon which the Constitutional provision was intended to operate, and you have, therefore, no authority to comply with the requisition made upon you by the Governor of Kentucky; and that the conclusion arrived at 'is conformable to the ancient and settled usage of the State.'

Gov. Dennison, with 'sentiments of highest respect,' so informs Gov. Magoffin, who responds at length in the most lugubrious tones over the loss of a 'comely wench'—introduces in closing that new and fresh Southern topic of speech and official letter-writing, 'a dissolution of the Union'—and winds up with the following most ominous

'P. S. Under a sense of duty to the people I have the honor to represent, and in view of the large number of slaves annually enticed away from their owners by emissaries sent from Ohio, whom you refuse to surrender, I shall cause this correspondence to be published.'—[Cleveland Leader.

ITALIAN AND AMERICAN LIBERTY.—The Independent publishes the following extract of a private letter from Mrs. Stowe:

'Liberty! Americans have forgotten what the word means. Pampered children of prosperity, with both hands full of opportunity, and none to hinder the fullest use of it!—they know nothing what liberty or slavery means! Only the Africans of the South are learning in a hard school to be patriots and heroes—learning in bitter sighings and endless longings how fair is Freedom.'

'The earthquake that shakes Austria and Italy and France is under America also!—the ground trembles there also with the approaching footsteps of the great Deliverer, who shall save the poor and needy, and precious shall their blood be in his sight. Blood of Roman peasant or African slave is alike the blood of Christ's child, and for every drop will he reckon America has reaped one man in these degenerate days whose name burns as a coal upon foreign lips. Speak of John Brown to a Frenchman or Italian, and he says, "That noble man,

that hero!" They can understand how a man should give his life for a hopeless cause, for they have lists of noble names that have done the same, and it is only when liberty and honor are dearer than life that nations are worthy to be free.'

AN UNFORTUNATE JUDGE.—Judge James Thomas of Georgia has met with misfortune, as the following advertisement from the Atlanta Intelligencer will show:

'200 REWARD.—Ran away from me on the 19th inst., at night my Negro Maa Ben, about 24 years of age, about 5 feet 11 inches high, spare made, of yellow complexion and bright; has but one-fourth negro blood in him. He has a very long head of hair, or bushy head; hair very black, not hinky, but very curly; thin visage. He would weigh, I suppose, not to exceed 130 pounds; he speaks slow; rather inclined to look down when spoken to, but exceedingly intelligent, and a first rate mechanic, equal, and, I think, surpasses any man in the State, white or black. His character heretofore has been spotless. I raised him as my body servant. He has traveled all over the State of Georgia with me, to all the principal cities, and through many of the adjoining States. He wore off a new pair of cotton pants, a bleached homespun shirt, a white striped yarn coat, striped with cotton and yarn, called a sack coat. He carried off with him one pair of broadcloth pants, one light doe-colored sack coat—don't know the material; one vest with broad flowers, one common negro hat, one soft, neat, black hat, one pair of coarse drawers, one pair of new suspenders, one pair of worn fine shoes, with red lining inside, beside one pair of negro shoes. I suppose he will make for a free State, most probably through Atlanta, Chattanooga, Nashville and Louisville.

'I will pay the above reward for him if caught and deposited in a safe jail, so that I can get him, without the County of Hancock. I doubt not that he will travel by railroad, and may easily be arrested by the Mayors or any other person. He will most probably travel under the care of some white man. He is personally known by very many intelligent men in Georgia. From his former good character he could easily impose upon many of my friends, either to take him in charge or to put him on the cars. He went off with a black mustache, but, from his intelligence, I doubt not he will cut them off.

JAS. THOMAS, Hancock Co., Ga.

'Chattanooga Advertiser, Nashville Union and American, and Louisville Journal, will please copy three times daily, and send bills to Judge James Thomas, Sparta, Hancock County, Georgia.'

THE SALE OF SLAVES OF THE INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT DEPARTMENT.—There were sold, on the 9th ult., seventy-nine negroes, ranging in years from thirty-seven to sixty-five years of age, the property of the Internal Improvement Department of the State of Louisiana, sold on account of the approval of an act, entitled 'An Act providing for the sale of the slaves belonging to the Internal Improvement Department of the State,' which act makes it the duty of the Governor to cause to be sold, in the city of New Orleans, for cash, to the highest bidder, after sixty days notice, and under such regulations and restrictions as he may prescribe, all the slaves belonging to the Internal Improvement Department of the State, except eight. The slaves brought a fraction over \$74,000, which is a very good sale, considering their ages.—Among them there were two engineers, four blacksmiths, good and tolerable; three pilots, three carpenters, two cooks, ten mates, &c.—[New Orleans Delta.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH SOUTH.—A straggling fellow, passing himself off as a white man, but believed to be a free negro, was soundly whipped at Kingsville, yesterday, between two and three o'clock, in the afternoon, by Mr. B. F. Coe, from the firm of Strous, Hartman, Hoffman & Co. of Baltimore. Mr. Cole overheard Hare say that Maryland was an Abolition State, in a boastful way. He immediately gave it the lie, and made toward him. Some words ensued, during which the true-hearted (!) Baltimorean manfully stood his ground, and the straggler gave abundant evidence of his being an Abolitionist of the most low and dirty character. Soon it was suspected that he was but an impudent free negro, from some northern locality. Mr. Cole then took him aside into an apartment of the Kingsville Hotel, made him peel off, and gave him the limit of the law, well filled, pressed down and shaken together, upon his bare back.—[Sumter (S. C.) Watchman.

MISCELLANEOUS NEWS ITEMS.

—Who is Thaddeus Hyatt, who has come off victorious over the Inquisition of slavery?—Not a poor adventurer, trying to make capital out of an imprisonment, but a scholar, a Republican, a New England manufacturer, and worth over a quarter of a million of dollars.

—The Richmond Enquirer announces a wonderful revival among the colored F. F. V.'s of that city, whereupon the Boston Traveller coolly remarks:—'Three hundred negroes were baptized the other day in a Virginia river. Do the Virginians allow negroes to go to heaven? That would be to lose sight of them forever and ever.'

—The Havana (Cuba) Messenger of the 8th inst. says:—'It is advised upon good authority that an American war steamer has captured an American schooner in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico, having on board 400 Africans, which, with the vessel, have been taken to Key West, making in deposit there about 2,000 negroes, with cargoes previously landed.'

—In view of the law prohibiting the manumission of slaves in Maryland, which was passed on the first of March and went into operation on the first of June, (see act published elsewhere in our columns,) one hundred and thirty-six slaves were manumitted in one county alone before the law could take effect.

—A 'noble army of martyrs to their prejudices,' who reside in the town of Mathews, in the State of Virginia, recently assembled on the village green, and burned a small edition of Spurgeon's Sermons. They then went home, and still the world moved on.

—The Union of this city states that the town of Oramel, Allegany Co., was thrown into great excitement on Friday last, caused by the arrival of two Rochester officers in search of a man named Burch, who had been passing counterfeit money in this city. It so happened that two fugitive slaves from the South had arrived in Oramel the same day, and the good people of that town, thinking that the officers were in pursuit of the slaves, immediately set to work to get up a 'rescue,' under the leadership of a colored man named Lisle, who is well acquainted with such matters, having done good execution years ago when Jerry was rescued from the man-hunters at Syracuse. They were not satisfied until they saw the officers start for Rochester with the counterfeiter in custody.

—James G. Birney, son of the old Radical Abolition candidate for President, now deceased, was a prominent aspirant for the Republican nomination for Congress in the Lansing district, Michigan. After eleven ballots he was defeated by 29 to 22, the nomination going to R. E. Trowbridge, a farmer.

—A Mississippi planter has purchased a house in Cleveland for his emancipated daughter, an octofoon, sixteen years old. Her income is to be \$3,000 a year, and no pains or expense are to be spared in giving her a thorough education.

—Hon. F. P. Blair of St. Louis, (Republican,) has resigned his seat in Congress to take effect at the close of the present session. He informs his constituents that he made the contest for his seat as their representative and to sustain them. Having been supported by a majority of the House in claiming his rights he now chooses to resign his seat and go to the people again, and receive their verdict also.

—The cause of free labor in Missouri is receiving large accessions this season from Germany. Over three hundred industrious Germans, principally vine-growers, have already reached St. Louis, in consequence of the efforts of the agent of the 'Farmers' and Vine Growers' Society. The ships in Bremen are said to be crowded, mostly with passengers for that State.

—When the martyr Brown was executed on a Virginia scaffold, the bells were tolled in many of the cities and villages in the North—among others, in Manchester, N. H. The Mayor interfered, and kicked the ringer out of the belfry. In consideration of this 'noble' act, the 'Sons of New Hampshire' residing at Washington, propose to present him with a cane.

—Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe was one of the passengers which arrived in the steamship Europa at Boston last week. She is said to be engaged to write another novel for the Atlantic Monthly.

—The Japanese Embassy did not escape the cupidity of the slave-dealers while in Washington in thought and speech, although they were teased and teted from motives of diplomatic policy by the pro-slavery Administration. They were regarded as nothing but 'niggers' by the Dred Scottites, and it is probable that Mr. Keitt, of South Carolina, was not far from prophetic truth when he declared:—'We will treat these fellows well now, but in a few years we will sell them as we do any others niggers.'

—A colony of fifty-seven persons will sail from New York for Africa in a few weeks, with the requisite machinery for raising and preparing cotton in the Uplands of Western Africa. A subscription of \$10,000 has been made in London, to be paid them as soon as the Colony is established.

—A numerous-attended and highly-interesting meeting of the members and friends of the London Emancipation Committee was recently held at Anderton's Hotel, for the purpose of presenting an address to the Baron L'Instant Pradine, the Charge D'Affaires for Hayti, on his return to his own country. George Thompson, Esq., presided, and made some suitable introductory observations, in the course of which he sketched some of the leading circumstances in the history of Hayti, and expressed great admiration for General Geffard and the Republic which he has recently established.

—Madame Emilie Zulavsky Kossuth died at her residence in Brooklyn, July 29th, aged 43 years. She was a sister of Louis Kossuth, and had been in this country since the memorable visit of the distinguished Hungarian exile.

—One of the heroes of Harper's Ferry, writing to the Anglo-African from the Western Reserve, Ohio, says:—'The attitude of the anti-slavery people of North-Western Ohio, (and their name is legion,) threatening armed resistance, which might easily ultimate in civil war, to the United States, should they attempt to arrest John Brown, Jr., has at last backed them completely down, and no doubt helped the release of Thaddeus Hyatt.'

—The Committee for raising the subscription for a statue to Horace Mann, intend to secure the co-operation of the school children of Massachusetts in the work. To that end, a framed likeness of Horace Mann has been promised to every school collecting five dollars, and for every one subscribing four dollars one not framed.

—Two slaves, mother and son, arrived in Boston a few days ago. They had been given their freedom by their owner, a citizen of Mobile, Alabama, who also presented them with an order on a gentleman in Boston for \$100.

—Seventy-eight slaves were sold in New Orleans on the 9th ult., for \$74,720. These slaves averaged forty-six years of age, and brought within a fraction of \$1,000 round. Terms cash on delivery. Eighty others were sold, ranging from twelve months to fifty-five years, for \$1,250 round, on terms equivalent to cash. The highest price paid for field hands was for men ranging from eighteen to twenty-five years, \$1,600 to \$2,000; women from \$1,500 to \$1,600. The demand was very great.

—The Washington Constitution gives currency to a statement that a vigilance committee, composed of one hundred and fifty persons, has been formed in Orange County, Va., for the purpose of ridding the country of certain disreputable characters who are suspected of various crimes, the principal being dealing with slaves, and inciting the latter to steal. Several of the suspected persons have been arrested and ordered to leave. One of them was first publicly whipped.

—The three candidates for the Governorship of Arkansas are Thomas Hubbard, Richard M. Jonson and Henry M. Rector.—Tom. Dick and Harry.

—Theodore Parker's Society, says the Boston correspondent of the Tribune, is likely to continue. The Fraternity Lectures will be opened by Charles Sumner, and the course will be as brilliant as ever. Mr. Parker, by his will, gives many legacies. Wendell Phillips has his English State Trials, and Mr. Sumner his Parliamentary History and Debates. Mrs. Parker is to have such books as she selects, even if the whole: those which she does not want are bequeathed to the city of Boston for the public library. Mr. Parker's property consisted mainly in his books, upon which he habitually spent about one third of his income.

—The New Albany (Ind.) Tribune says that Wm. Letcher, a fugitive slave from Louisiana, residing in that city, committed suicide lately by shooting himself. He was half insane with the fear that he would be seized by his former owners and be carried back to the South. He leaves a wife and four children.

—The N. Y. Herald says that Hon. Gerrit Smith is a candidate for the Presidency. This is a mistake. Gerrit Smith has not been nominated by any body of men at Boston or elsewhere, so far as we know. He deserves to be President, and we might in the event of his selection, expect to see an Administration that would be clothed upon with that 'righteousness' which 'exalteth a nation.'

—Just previous to the law going into effect in Maryland, forbidding the manumission of slaves—June 1st—no less than ten slaves, belonging to different parties near Frederick, took time by the forelock, and made successful tracks for the North.

—The Citizens' Public Advertiser, a Republican paper published at Lexington, Mo., has been suppressed by a pro-slavery mob, for putting at the head of its columns the names of Lincoln and Hamlin.

—Judge Marvin, of the U. S. District Court South, has discharged the crews of the slavers Wildfire and William, captured with hundreds of African slaves on board, and brought in to Key West—the Judge deciding there was nothing in the law of 1820 to hold them. A passage was given them over to Havana, and they are at liberty to enter upon piratical expeditions again, assured of safety and good treatment if caught by United States cruisers. The mockery of holding some of the officers for trial is still being enacted.

—Tom, the blind negro pianist, has been giving concerts to crowded houses in Baltimore. Upwards of twelve hundred colored persons were present at one of his entertainments, who greeted his performance with immense enthusiasm.

—A Charlottesville (Va.) paper has an account of the cruel murder of a slave by a brutal overseer, who, after having severely whipped the negro, tied him hand and foot, and plunged him head downwards in a hoghead of water, where he was held three quarters of a minute. Upon being taken out he died within three minutes, and an inquest being held the verdict was, 'died of congestion of the brain.' In another case in which a negro died a minute or two after punishment, the verdict was, 'died of a combination of circumstances.'

—At a recent session of the County Court at Alexandria, Va., two men of mixed blood appeared before the court, and having proved themselves octofoons, asked the court to certify that they were not negroes. The court having heard the evidences, granted the certificates.

—Another application for a writ of habeas corpus was recently made by the friends of S. M. Booth, now imprisoned in Milwaukee by the Slave Power for assisting a slave to escape a year or two ago. The Judge refused it, and there were hints that a riot would not be an improbable result of the excitement on this account. His father, who had come a hundred miles and had not seen him for a year, was a few days ago refused admittance to him, and a box of strawberries sent him was not allowed to be delivered.

—The New York Tribune cautions the public against some colored persons who have been collecting money ostensibly for a Wesleyan Church in Toronto. A Mr. C. J. Carter is authorized by the church to receive funds for it, but others who are begging in its behalf are impostors.

—A dispatch from Newark, N. J., states that a negro boy, 11 years old, belonging to and accompanying a Mr. Rall, of Augusta Ga., who had been temporarily sojourning in the former city, has mysteriously disappeared, and it is supposed that the Abolitionists have smuggled him away.

—The highest court in North Carolina has sustained the will of a planter, which leaves \$60,000 to a negro woman and her six children, acknowledged to be his own. The planter's name was Elijah Willis, who died in Cincinnati in 1855, just after he had emancipated his slaves. Mr. Jolliffe conducted the case in behalf of the negro woman, who is now residing at New Richmond, Ohio.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SENATE DURING SENATOR SUMNER'S SPEECH.

An occasional correspondent of the Boston *Atlas & Bee* thus describes the scene in the Senate Chamber during the delivery of Charles Sumner's great anti-slavery speech:

Yesterday Senator Sumner made his long expected speech. It was understood that he would commence at 12 o'clock. Long before that time the galleries were filled to overflowing; nearly one half were ladies. The business of the morning went on quietly till nearly 12, when Southern Senators could be seen quietly leaving the hall, by the side doors. When the clock told the hour of 12, scarcely a dozen were left. But a gayer or more brilliant audience never graced the galleries than on this occasion. Every available seat upon the Republican side was literally packed with eager listeners. When the tall Massachusetts Senator arose, a dead silence fell upon the crowded hall and galleries. The slightest modulation of his voice was distinctly audible to the most distant hearer.

His opening was very impressive and eloquent. You can imagine his style, his manner, and the profound impression it made upon his vast auditory, when he said, 'I have no personal griefs to utter; only a barbarous egotism could intrude these into this chamber. I have no personal wrongs to avenge; only a barbarous nature could attempt to wield that vengeance which belongs to the Lord. The years that have intervened, and the toms that have opened since I spoke, have their voices too, which I cannot fail to hear.'

He then proceeded with the most elaborate and terrible argument against the institution of slavery ever delivered upon that floor, or anywhere else. It would be useless to describe the manner of Mr. Sumner to most of your readers. His whole manner discloses the ripe scholar, the finished logician, and the most accomplished rhetorician and elocutionist. His sentences fall in measured cadences, musical and rythmetical; his gestures are graceful and appropriate; his elocution distinct; his quotations classic, apt and appropriate; in short, he is the most finished scholar and the most graceful orator in the Senate.

Senator Hunter of Virginia listened respectfully, to its close. Not a muscle moved on his placid countenance to denote what was going on in his mind. Wigfall, the Texas Bombastese, was in a great torment. He would keep his seat for a few moments quietly, as if struggling to be a gentleman; then he would glide round noiselessly to some other Senator's seat, and confer in low whispers, as if debating whether it was best to remain quiet or not.

Mr. Breckenridge, who was not in the President's chair, remained through the entire delivery. He made a strong effort to appear indifferent, sitting with an open book in his hand, listlessly turning its pages, but his eyes turning to the speaker, and finally, with a frown upon his brow, he laid aside his book and regarded the speaker intently till he closed. After an hour or two the absent Senators began to come back, and one after another dropped into their seats. Jeff. Davis was busily engaged reading the *Globe*.

Keitt, the accomplice of Brooks, came in from the other House, and with much nonchalance took his seat near Senator Hammond, and turned his monkey's face up to the galleries, as if to notice the dramatic effect of his presence upon them. But finding that no one seemed to notice him, he gradually began to give heed to the speech. Then his vulgar phiz became disturbed with angry grimaces and frowns.

By this time many Democratic members of the other House had come over to hear Mr. Sumner, so that with them and the returning Senators, the body of the Senate chamber was as densely crowded as the galleries. Mr. Sumner spoke four hours, and held his immense audience, which could not have been less than five thousand, to its close. It was a most remarkable effort, and take it all in all, it was a scene and an occasion never to be forgotten.

Radical Abolition Convention.—There will be a Convention of Radical Abolitionists held at Syracuse the fourth Wednesday of August next, at 10 o'clock A. M., to nominate candidates for President and Vice President of the United States; also to nominate candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of this State.

The men and women of this and other States, who occupy radical positions in Anti-Slavery and Temperance, are invited to attend.

W. W. CHAPMAN, } *Central*
J. C. HARRINGTON, } *Committee.*
OTIS SIMMONS, }

Minetto, July 5th, 1860.

'THE GREAT SLAVE-TRADING PORT OF THE WORLD'—The debate in the Senate on Monday last, upon the proposition to increase the African squadron, brought prominently before the country the fact that the city of New York is the seat and centre of the slave trade in this country, and perhaps of the world. Senator Wilson stated in the course of his remarks, that he held in his hand a list of nine vessels that had sailed from that city since the 31st of December last, to engage in the slave trade, and he added that another had sailed within a few days, making a total of ten; which is a little over the rate of one slaver every fortnight. Senator Seward also stated that he had prepared a bill a year ago, containing stringent provisions for the suppression of the trade, which he frankly admitted was carried on 'chiefly in the city of New York.' One of the preventive measures proposed by him, was to follow and seize the vessel if she should escape from New York, or if she should escape from the coast of Africa with her cargo, then to pursue her to the United States. He said, moreover, that this bill was submitted by him to the gentleman representing the Southern States, and that he came to the conclusion that the administration, and the majority, if not the whole of the Southern Senators, were in good faith desirous to arrest the slave trade as it is carried on in American ports; and he added the following startling declaration:—'I say also that the objections to that bill came not so much from the slave States as from the commercial interest of New York.' Mr. Seward's statement was made gravely and cautiously, and as he himself is one of the representatives of the Empire State, and may be supposed to understand the character of his constituents, it is entitled to very serious consideration.—*Phil. Inquirer.*

—Another reason why the Senate released Thaddeus Hyatt was on the ground that he had become a very troublesome prisoner. Having much leisure on his hands, he made a pretty thorough examination into the management of the Washington jail. His investigations resulted in the discovery that the jail was being used as a slave pen, in violation of the Compromise Measures of 1850, which forbid the slave traffic within the District; also, that free colored men were frequently thrust into prison without color of law, and compelled to pay largely, in the form of pretended legal fees, for obtaining their liberty.

—Judge Terry, the murderer of Senator Broderick, has obtained a 'change of venue,' and he will be tried in Marion Co., California, which, a cotemporary says, is equivalent to saying he will be acquitted.

—R. A. Chambers offers a reward of \$200 for the arrest and commitment to jail, at Troy, N. C., of a runaway slave, charged with the murder of a minister, at Pekin, N. C., on the 23d of May last, three other negroes being accessory to the crime.

—The Banneker Institute of Philadelphia, an association of colored gentlemen, celebrated the 4th of July in a befitting manner. The Declaration of Independence was read, and an oration delivered by Rev. Mr. Gibbs. Addresses were also delivered by Messrs. Wears, Bowers, Chester and Parker T. Smith. Resolutions were adopted endorsing the Declaration of Independence, protesting against the wicked and unjust imprisonment of the Philadelphia rescuers; protesting against being tried in courts of law by juries not their peers, and protesting against being taxed without being fairly represented.

TERMS OF DOUGLASS' MONTHLY.

Single Copies, to American subscribers, \$1 per year.
" " " to British " 5.. sterling.

Subscriptions must be paid for *invariably in advance*. All communications, whether on business or for publication, should be addressed to

FREDERICK DOUGLASS, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

AGENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

We take the liberty of using the names of the following gentlemen who will receive names and subscriptions for *Dougllass' Monthly* in Great Britain:

Halifax—Rev. RUSSELL LANT CARPENTER, Milton Place; Rev. Dr. CROFTS, North Parade.
London—Mr. L. A. CAMEROVZOW, Anti-Slavery Office, 27, New Broad Street, E. C.
Dublin—Mr. Wm. WEBB, 52, High Street, and 8, Dunville Avenue, Rathmines.
Derby—Dr. SPENCER T. HALL, Burton Road.
Glasgow—Mr. JOHN SMITH, 173, Trongate.
Leeds—Mr. ARTHUR HOLLAND, 4, Park Row.
Newcastle-on-Tyne—Mr. WALTER S. PRINGLE.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

We have received the following subscriptions from our subscribers at Newcastle-on-Tyne:

Mrs. Robinson, Mrs. Lance, Mr. G. Black, John Fenwick, Mrs. W. A. Whinfield, Miss Pringle, Mrs. George Steward, James Watson, Matthew Foster, Henry Clapham, Henry Tennant, Daniel Oliver, Evington Ridley, Robert Foster, Edward Richard, son, Ellen Richardson, Anna H. Richardson, Mrs. Walter Morrison, Mr. Heughan—5 shillings sterling each.

SYRACUSE, July 5th, 1860.

DEAR DOUGLASS:—I wish through your paper to acknowledge a kind donation of £17 from the Old World—from the Ladies' Anti Slavery Society of Liverpool, £12; from the Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society of Berwick-on-Tweed, £5—all of which is in behalf of the fugitives constantly calling on me for aid to get out of the country. I thank these kind friends for their kind remembrance of my suffering people in this the land of their birth. These donations, with many others received during the last two years from the same land, I owe my thanks most to my never-to-be-forgotten friend, Mrs. Julia G. Crofts. I know not what I should have done for help for these fleeing friends, if it had not been for the aid sent to me through the labors and advice of Mrs. Crofts. If it had not been for the friendship of this very kind lady, I know not that my labors in connection with the Underground Railroad mission would have ever been understood by the good people in the Old World.

Yours, for Liberty, J. W. LOGUEN,
Agent of the Underground Railroad.

The Rochester Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society gratefully acknowledge the donations of £12 from the Liverpool Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society, and £5 from the Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society of Berwick-on-Tweed.

MARIA G. PORTER, *Treasurer.*

Mr. David Todd, on taking the Chair of the Democratic Convention at Baltimore, after the Southerners had seceded, remarked that he lived in Giddings's District, and had been fighting that old Abolitionist for thirty years.—An Alabama wag remarked, 'I don't think you hurt him much!'

ROCHESTER COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE

N. W. BENEDICT AND L. R. SATERLEE,
PRINCIPALS,

Rochester, Monroe County, N. Y.

THIS INSTITUTION offers the superior advantages of a *Model School*, systematic and thorough in every department.

With a complete Academic and Collegiate course of study, it combines, under the best Artists and Teachers that can be procured, instruction in Painting, Drawing, Vocal and Instrumental Music.

The city and its schools have special and peculiar advantages for the attainment of all the graceful accomplishments, and superior social culture. Such facilities it is the earnest aim of this Institution to furnish.

The new Boarding Hall, in charge of one of the Principals, is devoted exclusively to the accommodation of young ladies from abroad. The number of boarders is limited to forty. The rooms, designed for two occupants, are neatly furnished, warmed, and lighted by gas. Expenses are moderate. Those interested should make immediate application to one of the Principals.

Fall Term commences Monday, Sept 3d, 1860. Circulars, giving additional information, sent on application. Rochester, July, 1860.